POLICY ON INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM PRIORITIES:
ACADEMIC PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION
AND ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT

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 to distribute 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.

The policy below mandates assignment of Sacramento State academic programs to quartiles reflecting different levels of accomplishment or positioning relative to a number of criteria. Quartile placement will inform the Provost's decisions concerning the allocation of resources (e.g., faculty positions, equipment funding) to Colleges in support of their undergraduate, graduate, and credential major, minor, and certificate programs. The program prioritization indicated by the quartile placement is not binding upon, but shall be given serious consideration by, the Provost in resource-related decisions.

Academic Program Prioritization

I. UNIVERSITY-WIDE PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

It is the responsibility of the University to establish which academic programs shall be given priority regarding academic-planning, resource-allocation, and enrollment-management. Such decisions shall be made within the structure of established shared-governance principles agreed upon by the Faculty Senate and the Administration, after prior consultation with the potentially affected Colleges and departments. The criteria employed to prioritize programs, in the present policy via placement within quartiles, shall be determined in an open and transparent manner. Judgments concerning quality of attributes and performance within the framework of the criteria in question shall rest upon available data (the Office of Institutional Research shall not be compelled to produce new or analyze a new extant data for the program prioritization process), the quality of which can be assessed. Using such available data, each academic department shall be responsible for describing how its programs promote the mission of the University, exhibit quality in multiple respects, and contribute to the desired balance and mix of programs offered by the University.

Program prioritization shall be implemented under the following guiding principles:

1. *Transparency*: Program assignment to a given quartile shall be explained through reference to the quality and sufficiency of the data presented by the department housing the program and data otherwise available to and identified by the implementers of the prioritization process.

2. *Comprehensiveness*: To the extent allowed by available information, programs shall be reviewed holistically, in the sense that all aspects of a program will be examined during the prioritization process.

3. *Consistency*: The same criteria shall be used to evaluate each program for prioritization. Data will be considered in the review in two-tiered fashion with greater weight assigned to "Primary Criteria" (60% of total "prioritization outcome") than to "Secondary Criteria" (40% of total "prioritization outcome"). No particular weights will be assigned to criteria within "Primary" and "Secondary" criteria sets. "Prioritization outcomes" will be reported for each criteria set and then a combined "prioritization outcome" will be reported (weighted appropriately toward "Primary Criteria"). The combined "prioritization outcome" will inform placement into an appropriate quartile.

4. *Inclusiveness*: All academic programs shall be evaluated and all faculty and staff members shall have the opportunity to provide input into the analysis of their programs.

5. *Utilization of Data:* Prioritization of programs shall be based on examination of both quantitative and qualitative data provided by the departments housing the programs and data otherwise available to and identified by the implementers of the prioritization process.

II. DESIRED BALANCE AND MIX OF PRIORITY PROGRAM CATEGORIES

For the purposes of this policy, a program is defined as a unit within Academic Affairs that offers degrees (graduate or undergraduate), credentials, minors, or certificates. Under this definition, service units within Academic Affairs are *not* 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 considered within the prioritization process.

Graduate programs are an essential part of the mission of the California State University and that of the mission of California State University, Sacramento. As such, a high priority is placed on maintaining a mix of graduate programs appropriate to a comprehensive, metropolitan university. To assure continued viability of graduate education at Sacramento State, the University shall strive to maintain a minimum degree-seeking graduate enrollment of 10% of the annual FTES of the University.

The University also shall strive to maintain a minimum enrollment of 5% of the annual FTES of the University in postbaccalaureate credential and related certificate programs, if consistent with and justified by demand and by regional need and agency data (e.g., the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing). 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. Consistent with Section III below, second-baccalaureate students shall be counted in undergraduate FTES totals.

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. Twelve criteria are specified for the purpose of comparing undergraduate programs across the University. The criteria (many adapted from Dickeson, 2010) are broad in nature and have been selected to capture as much information as possible about programs, in order to take into account the size, scope and nature of each program. For each criterion, examples of information/data are provided 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, when not relevant, 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 those programs:

Primary Criteria (60%; unprioritized, unweighted within set; precedence over Secondary Criteria)

- Quality of curriculum, instructional personnel, and curriculum delivery
  Are the program curriculum and faculty qualifications appropriate to breadth, depth and level of the discipline? How does the program use technology?
  - o Contemporary curriculum
  - o Curriculum rigor
  - o Faculty (and staff, where appropriate) qualifications
  - o Percent of instruction by full-time faculty
  - 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

- Clearly developed learning outcomes
  Has the program moved productively to clarify for students enrolled in it what they can expect to take away from the program and how that outcome is assessed? Has the program made curricular adjustments based on its assessment efforts?
  - o Clearly articulated program links to campus baccalaureate learning goals
  - o Updated plan that clearly identifies program learning goals, assessment strategies, and processes by which data inform program curriculum decisions
  - o External assessment and accreditation outcomes, where appropriate

- Advising program and graduation success
  Does the program have a well-articulated advising plan by which to track and facilitate student progress to graduation/degree completion? How well do students do after graduation (employment, graduate school, professional licensing and/or certification)?
  - o Graduation rate

- o Distribution of advising responsibilities among faculty members
- o Proactive advising contact with students to assure progress to degree
- o Program roadmap to curriculum completion and graduation success
- o Use of technology to supplement and strengthen program advising effort
- o Post-degree success, graduate impact on community, etc…

- Strength of teaching performance
  Is the faculty of the program collectively committed to providing high-quality instruction?
  - o Clearly articulated program statements regarding quality of teaching
  - o Ongoing, meaningful assessment of teaching performance of faculty, post-tenure
  - o Multiple measures of teaching performance of full-time and part-time faculty members
  - o Systematic program attention to problematic individual teaching performance

Secondary Criteria (40%, unprioritized, unweighted within set)

- 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?

- Program size, scope
  What is the program's breadth of curricular coverage? How many degrees and certificates are awarded? What is the enrollment per program element (major, minor, certificate)? Are the program's resources and faculty expertise appropriate to support and enhance the breadth and depth of university curriculum?
  - o Number and types of degrees, concentrations, and certificates awarded (relative to campus standards, or national standards, as appropriate)
  - o Annual FTES in major, minor, certificate elements of program

- Internal, non-major 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?
- o Service courses (accompanying AY FTES)
- o GE courses (accompanying AY FTES)
- o Research resources

- Quality of program and resource utilization
  How does the program use its resources to carry out its mission? Are those resources used efficiently and effectively?
  - o Faculty productivity in non-teaching areas
    - Scholarly and creative activity
    - Service
  - 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

- 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)?
  - o Enrollment-based budgetary support from University
  - o Research grants, in-kind equipment donations, fundraising
  - o Potential revenue (gifts, alumni support)
  - o 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?
  - o Dollars per FTES
  - o Dollars per degree produced
  - o Dollars per program

IV. PRIORITIES WITHIN GRADUATE EDUCATION ACROSS THE UNIVERSITY

The University is committed to offering graduate/credential programs leading to the master's, doctoral, or terminal degree, or postbaccalaureate credential or certificate in selected disciplines. Twelve criteria are specified for the purpose of comparing graduate/credential programs across the University. The criteria (many adapted from Dickeson, 2010) are broad in nature and have been selected to capture as much information as possible about programs, in order to take into account the size, scope and nature of each program. For each criterion, examples of information/data are provided 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, when not relevant, 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 those programs:

Primary Criteria (60%; unprioritized, unweighted within set; precedence over Secondary Criteria)

- Quality of curriculum, instructional personnel, and curriculum delivery
  Are the program curriculum and faculty qualifications appropriate to breadth, depth and level of the discipline? How does the program use technology?
  - Contemporary curriculum
  - Curriculum rigor
  - Faculty (and staff, where appropriate) qualifications
  - Percent of instruction by full-time faculty
  - 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

- Clearly developed learning outcomes
  Has the program moved productively to clarify for students enrolled in it what they can expect to take away from the program and how that outcome is assessed. Has the program made curricular adjustments based on its assessment efforts?
  - Updated plan that clearly identifies program learning goals, assessment strategies, and processes by which data inform program curriculum decisions.
  - External assessment and accreditation outcomes, where appropriate.

- Advising program and graduation success
  Does the program have a well-articulated advising plan by which to track and facilitate student progress to degree completion? How well do students do after degree completion (employment, further graduate work, professional licensing and/or certification)?
  - Degree completion rate
  - Distribution of advising responsibilities among faculty members
  - Proactive advising contact with students to assure progress to degree
  - Program roadmap to curriculum completion
  - Use of technology to supplement and strengthen program advising effort
  - Post-degree success, individual's impact on community, etc…

- Strength of teaching performance
  Is the faculty of the program collectively committed to providing high-quality instruction?
  - Clearly articulated program statements regarding quality of teaching
  - Ongoing, meaningful assessment of teaching performance of faculty, post-tenure
  - Multiple measures of teaching performance of full-time and part-time faculty members

- o Systematic program attention to problematic individual teaching performance

Secondary Criteria (40%, unprioritized, unweighted within set)

- 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?

- Program size, scope
  What is the program's breadth of curricular coverage? How many degrees and certificates are awarded? What is the enrollment per program element (major, credential, certificate)? Are the program's resources and faculty expertise appropriate to support and enhance the breadth and depth of university curriculum?
  - o Number and types of degrees, concentrations, and certificates awarded (relative to campus standards, or national standards, as appropriate)
  - o Annual FTES in major, credential, and certificate elements of program

- Internal, non-major 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 (accompanying AY FTES)
  - o GE courses (accompanying AY FTES)
  - o Research resources

- Quality of program and resource utilization
  How does the program use its resources to carry out its mission? Are those resources used efficiently and effectively?
  - o Faculty productivity in non-teaching areas
    - ▪ Scholarly and Creative Activity
    - ▪ Service

- 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

- • 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)?
    - o   Enrollment-based budgetary support from University
    - o   Research grants, in-kind equipment donations, fundraising
    - o   Potential revenue (gifts, alumni support)
    - o   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?
    - o   Dollars per FTES
    - o   Dollars per degree produced
    - o   Dollars per program

V. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICY

The process of making recommendations for academic prioritization shall result in four separate groupings-undergraduate degree programs (majors), other undergraduate programs (e.g., minors/certificates), graduate degree programs, and other graduate programs (e.g., credentials/certificates)-into quartiles based upon the criteria described in Section III for undergraduate programs) and Section IV (for graduate programs). Such grouping will be done by a new Senate 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 Committee on Instructional Program Priorities 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.

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

Membership of the committee shall consist of:

- Up to seven tenured/tenure-track faculty members from the college-based pool of nominations. No more than one from each College.
- Up to two tenured/tenure-track electing unit Senate representatives appointed from the pool of senate nominees. The two senate appointees shall not be from the same College.

Process for selecting committee membership

Nominations for College-Based Seats
> The Senate shall invite nominations for college-based seats. Nominations may be made by self-nominations, by Academic Council or equivalent body of the College or by other members of the faculty. The College, however, cannot revise the nomination process as stated.

Nominations for Senate-Based Seats
> The Senate shall invite nominations from the electing unit representatives of Senate membership to fill two Senate seats. Nominations may be made by self-nomination or by other members of the Faculty Senate. Elections for these seats will follow the elections for the college-based seats.

Nominee Statements
> Each nominee shall submit for Senate consideration a brief statement regarding his/her interests and qualifications to serve as members of the committee. Nominations along with candidate statements shall be presented to the Senate. Statements shall not exceed one-page.

Committee Appointments
> The Senate may appoint no more than one faculty member from each of the colleges in the college-based pool of nominations. In addition, the Senate may appoint no more than two tenured/tenure-track electing unit Senate representatives from the Senate pool of nominations. The two Senate appointees shall not be from the same College.

Membership of the Senate Committee on Instructional Program Priorities shall invite, through the Provost, 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 their review by programs and eventual archiving 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 Senate Committee on Instructional Program Priorities, the question of whether or not to form a new Senate Committee on Instructional Program Priorities 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 Senate Committee on Instructional Program Priorities 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 Committee on Instructional Program Priorities 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 regarding each criterion within each of the two criteria sets. The recommendation for the preliminary overall grouping of each program shall be based upon the program's relative standings in each of the criteria sets, with appropriate weights applied to each set (see Section I.3 above).

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 by the Senate Committee on Instructional Program Priorities utilizing the same criteria and processes by which the initial recommendations were achieved.
    d. 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

Approved by Alexander Gonzalez, President
October 11, 2011