Program Prioritization Plan

This document will outline major initiatives to be taken in academic year 2016-2017 in order to more efficiently allocate resources, align activities with the University's mission, comply with our accrediting agency’s expectations, and institutionalize assessment practices. This plan is comprised of three major initiatives.

1) Program Prioritization

2) Program Assessment and Review

3) Opening Pathways

Program Prioritization:

Program prioritization is an open process where an institution evaluates all its programs in order to group them or rank them in such a fashion that resources can then be allocated according to the value the institution places on that program. A program is defined as any activity which utilizes University resources (personnel, space, finances, etc.). The process is data driven and therefore, data intensive. The analysis focuses on preselected criteria. The end result is that the institution has a systematic basis to identify opportunities to increase revenue, reduce costs, improve program quality, align programs with institutional goals, and strengthen institutional reputation.

During the 2016-2017 academic year, the Cabinet, the deans, several chairs, as well as chosen faculty and staff will read the book "Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services" written by Robert Dickeson as a guiding philosophy for this process.

As the Cabinet and deans review the book and the prioritization process, this researcher feels it will be clear that SCU is not positioned to begin this endeavor in the 2016-2017 academic year due to the lack of sufficient institutional data to support the review process. With the addition of the new Director of Institutional Effectiveness, this process will be possible and achievable in AY 2017-2018.

Data for program prioritization must be publically available so that all areas use common data sets. The VPAA/deans have started to collect data, but the process has been slow due to the other areas that must be completed in the area of program review and assessment for the upcoming monitoring reports due to HLC in January 2017. The summer was also needed to gather the following data and prepare for program review completion in 2016-2017. The summer also entailed the beginning process for the revamping of the General Education foundation curriculum. The goal is to have all data available via the SCU website in a drill-down, readable format. With the use of LiveText, SCU should be able to provide the analysis and presentation of the data. The VPAA/deans would gather a minimum of three years of data, but where possible, 5 years of data will be provided.

The following data should be be gathered via the CAMS and LiveText system. Data from CAMS and LiveText system will form the common data set from which all programs/departments/school/colleges will draw from. Getting this data is of the highest priority. In each case where data is gathered, every effort will be made to provide information down to the program/degree level, however, data may only be available down to the department level. The common data set will be completed by December 2017.

General Data (trended by department, school and college):

1. Number of freshmen (break out)
2. Number of graduates
3. Number of students
4. Demographic information
   1. Percent of freshmen by ethnicity
   2. Percent of freshmen by country
   3. Percent of freshmen by state
   4. d.Socio-Economic

Quality of Students (trended by department and school):

1. Incoming student ACT & HS-GPA data
2. Graduating student ACT & HS-GPA data
3. SCU GPA at graduation
4. Ratio of cumulative SCU GPA to HS GPA
5. External transfer student graduation rate

Demand for the Program (trended by department and school):

1. Number of external (non-SCU student) transfers in
2. Number of internal (SCU student) transfers in

Program Completion/Success (trended by department and school):

1. 6 year graduation rate
2. Ratio of declared majors to graduates
3. Percent graduation rate in original degree
4. Persistence at SCU (% graduating at SCU)

Beginning with the fall semester, Chairs and School Deans will be charged with gathering additional data for review. The general topics for which reporting is required are given below. In each case, suggested sources of data or suggested data are provided. For each program the report would indicate…

External Data: Insight into future programmatic demand and competition (duplication) & student demand and success after graduation.

1. Projected need (future demand)
   1. Review websites for this information
   2. Other documented need
2. List of competing programs in the state (other programs)
3. 6-month placement rates (into job & graduate school)
4. Results on major field/placement tests
5. Licensure results
6. Results of any nationally normed tests

Faculty Information:

1. Number of faculty at each degree level (Baccalaureate, Masters, Doctorate)
2. Teaching awards and recognition (SCU and other)
3. Other narrative on faculty credentials (licensure, field experience, etc.)
4. Number of publications; presentations; refereed journals, books, book reviews, etc.
5. Level of publications; refereed, peer reviewed, etc.
6. External grants and contracts
7. % of faculty involved in research (last three to five years)
8. % of faculty involved in grants (last three to five years)
9. % of faculty involved in publication (last three to five years)
10. % of faculty in practice in their fields (last three to five years)
11. % of teaching done by adjuncts
12. Comment on the availability of qualified adjuncts

Community Service (Faculty, Staff, Students)

1. Service on Boards
2. Recruiting
3. Mentoring
4. Volunteer work
5. Branding the image of SCU

In addition to the common data sets and the data gathered by departments, SCU would attempt to gather the following information. The President’s Cabinet will pursue these to the best of their ability during the AY 2016-2017.

Use of Infrastructure:

1. Square footage allocated to program (by building, not including SCU controlled classrooms)
2. Cost per square foot by building

Cost of Instruction (trended by department, school and college):

1. Faculty, Adjunct, and Overload costs
2. SCH generated
3. Cost per SCH (using various formats)
4. Program Revenues (tuition, grants, fees, other)
5. List of all courses offered. Denoting which are required/elective in degree programs.

All data will be gathered and then summarized in narratives. The end result of program prioritization will be a thorough review of all academic programs (BA/BS) to at least the department level; ideally to the program level. It is expected that all programs/departments self-identify themselves using the following options…

Categorize the program:

1. Critical that it exists
2. Important that it exists
3. Not essential, but desirable
4. Not essential

Eventually the overall goal is to develop a plan, based on data gathered, that will define future program direction, clarify mission and lead to resource re-allocation. Because SCU does not expect new resources, re-allocation of existing resources appears to be the only option.

Overall Goal:

1. 10-15% of programs will be identified for enrichment
2. 25-30% of programs will be identified for continuation at a higher level of support
3. 25-30% of programs will be identified for continuation at the current level of support
4. 25-30% of programs will be identified for continuation at a lower level of support
5. 10-15% of programs will be identified as a candidate for elimination

The following timeline for program prioritization is presented below.

1. Generate publically available common data sets (summer 2016)
2. Present plan to academics (fall 2016)
3. Open period for comment and modification of plans (fall 2016 - 2 weeks)
4. Create Program Review Committee: PRC (fall 2016)
5. Program Review Committee (PRC) determines data weights consistent with SCU mission (fall 2016)
6. Gather program, department, school, and college data (fall 2016)
7. PRC to finalize report format (fall 2016)
8. Generate program reports (spring 2017)
9. Present reports to PRC by spring break 2017
10. PRC renders findings to VPAA and SCU (May 2017)
11. Open period for comment (June 2017)
12. VPAA provide written plan and timeline
13. Open period for comment (August 2017)
14. Plan implemented (fall 2017)

Each School will submit one report, detailing the information for all its degree programs. The report will contain the following sections.

School introduction and program history (beginning of School report):

Provide a 300-600 word introduction (depending on the number of programs) describing the history of the school and its degrees programs.

**From this point forward, until noted, each item is to be discussed at the program level.**

Data provided by Office of Institutional Effectiveness:

Tables, by degree of data collected from the common data sets.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Degree Program: Place Degree Name Here** | | |  |  |  |
|  | **2016**  **2017** | **2017**  **2018** | **2018**  **2019** | **2019**  **2020** | **2020**  **2021** |
| **General Information** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Freshmen |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of External Transfers In |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Internal Transfers In |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| Composite Freshmen ACT |  |  |  |  |  |
| Composite Graduate ACT |  |  |  |  |  |
| Composite Graduate GPA |  |  |  |  |  |
| Six Year Graduation Rate (degree) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Six Year Graduation Rate (SCU) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Faculty |  |  |  |  |  |
| Demographics |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oklahoma |  |  |  |  |  |
| Out of State (U.S.A.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Out of Country |  |  |  |  |  |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asian |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native American |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pell/BIA |  |  |  |  |  |

*Diversity* - Provide a 300 word narrative of student interest/recruitment and placement:

The focus of the narrative is to define the internal and external demand for the program. Provide a review of enrollment trends (past and future) and success in placing graduates. Discuss the program’s importance to student recruitment; both internal and external to SCU.

*Quality: Faculty* - Provide a 300 word narrative of program quality:

Discuss student and faculty quality and service. Discuss the program’s role in attracting quality faculty. External measures of quality/need might include national accreditation, regional/national recognition, specialized labs and/or equipment, comparative rankings, etc.

*Quality: Outcomes* - Provide a 600 word narrative on program assessment (reviewing the quality of outcomes): Discuss the status of program assessment which includes:

* 1. Program outcome statements
  2. Course and degree program assessment plans
  3. Yearly assessment report
  4. Feedback from students, faculty, alumni, advisory boards, etc.
  5. Clearly defined feedback process with documented results
  6. Short- and long-term goals with actions plans in place

*Demand* - Provide a 300 word narrative of future needs:

Provide long-term program goals (5-10 years). Define and report on opportunities for advancing the program. Define, quantitatively and qualitatively the obstacles to moving the program towards its long-term goals. Report on the current status of equipment/lab and other resources. Has the program kept facilities current? How will future equipment needs be met (external funding or SCU funding).

*Revenue* - Provide a 300 word narrative on revenue:

Define and quantify revenue generated over the last five years. Are these revenue streams expected to continue?

*Costs* - Provide a 300 word narrative on productivity:

This section will be defined after the SCU administration can better define program costs. The section will review cost, outputs, and expenses in a standardized fashion; yet to be determined.

*Scope* - Provide a 300 word narrative on opportunities:

Describe any options for continuation of the program in a different format (emphasis, minor, AS degree, etc.). Are there any duplicated efforts on campus? Can efficiency be increased through collaboration?

*Mission* - Provide a 300 word narrative of alignment with SCU mission:

The focus in this section is on the program’s overall essentiality to the institution. Discuss the importance of the program with respect to achieving the SCU Mission or strategic plans/goals.

*Essentiality* - Final Program Statement:

It is expected that all programs self-identify using the following options… Categorize the program:

1. Critical that it exists
2. Important that it exists
3. Not essential, but desirable
4. Not essential

The report will end with an optional School level review of low-enrolled programs that do not cost the institution anything to support, due to their integration with critical, mission aligned programs.

Provide a 300 word narrative on “no cost to SCU” (if applicable):

Explain how integrated programs are within the school in which they reside or within the University (other academic areas), to the point that the program(s) is/are offered at no cost to SCU.

New programs can be proposed while the program prioritization process is ongoing. Some areas are beginning to review the possible addition of MA/MS degrees and adult study program offerings at SCU. Academic administration believes that SCU should seriously review options to develop 1 or 2 unique master’s level degree programs for implementation by 2018-2019. Programs should be built on existing BS/BA programs that have a strong enrollment, high measures of demonstrated quality, documented future demand, ties to unique resources (SCU or regional), and sufficient numbers of Ph.D. qualified faculty to support a master’s program. The master’s program itself should be conventional but with a unique component to differentiate it from the typical MS/MA degrees regionally and/or nationally. It will need to be self-sufficient financially, within three years, and have a creative method to recruit students, such as offering teaching- or research- assistant positions (contractual issues may arise).

The same process should be considered to the possible addition of BA/BS degrees and program offerings at SCU. It will also need to be self-sufficient financially, within three years, and have a creative method to recruit students, such as offering teaching- or research- assistant positions or temporary full-time faculty to fill these new positions until they are sustainable.

Program Assessment and Review:

The term “assessment” has been defined in a variety of ways and therefore it’s important to understand the term’s definition in education today. The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) has identified five fundamental questions for institutions to use in discussing and defining assessment:

1. *How are your stated student learning outcomes appropriate to your mission, programs, and degrees?*
2. *What evidence do you have that students achieve your stated learning outcomes?*
3. *In what ways do you analyze and use evidence of student learning?*
4. *How do you ensure shared responsibility for assessment of student learning?*
5. *How do you evaluate and improve the effectiveness of your efforts to assess and improve student learning?*

Using these questions, the following is offered as an operational definition for SCU.

*Assessment is an on-going, evaluative process focused on improving student learning. It requires the institution to make its learning expectations clear to students and to establish appropriate learning outcomes at the course and program levels. It helps determine how well student performance matches the expected outcomes. The resulting information is used to improve student learning by making changes in the courses, programs, and resource allocations to improve student learning. The process is institutionalized and conducted openly.*

The program assessment and review initiative addresses several areas where SCU falls short in meeting the minimal standards for accreditation as noted by the University’s accrediting agency, the HLC.

Minimal Standard: List minimum criteria issue from last review.

Status: List where we are right now in meeting this criteria and our report due in January 2017?

Plan: How do we plan to do this?

Minimal Standard: List minimum criteria from last review

Status:

Plan:

Minimal Standard: List minimum criteria issue from last review

Status:

Plan:

The VPAA will work throughout the 2016-2017 year with the Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Coordinator of General Education and Assessment to develop an institutional archival system for the tracking, storage, and evaluation of assessment related activities and reports. A review of the resources needed to implement this plan and maintain the assessment review process will be conducted in the summer of 2017. This will enable the institution to meet the criteria for accreditation in all 5 areas.

Beyond meeting these minimal standards, several other related activities will be undertaken. These include:

1. The VPAA will provide resources to ensure the activities can be maintained and are part of a wider institutional effort in continuous improvement.
2. The President’s Cabinet will work with Institutional Research to develop updated peer institution lists for comparatives studies in all curricular and co-curricular areas.
3. A review of library and IT funding levels will be conducted. These two areas should be strengthened to support the heart of SCU academic quality. Survey results have shown that this is the highest demand area among faculty, staff and students.
4. The VPAA will review online education; developing levels for engagement, training for faculty, and reviewing hosting options.
5. The VPAA will review options to automate the data collection for Board of Regents reporting (optional) and professional activity reporting.
6. Other issues recognized from the two accreditation visits that could be strengthened.
7. Discuss recommendations made by both teams here.

Opening Pathways:

The initiative to address opening pathways for the institution will examine a variety of bodies, activities, policies and procedures that could potentially act as roadblocks in the implementation of the various components of the academic improvement plan. Some of these include the role of the Board of Regents, upper level administration, and General Education and Curriculum Committee procedures. The process will be ongoing and other issues may surface as the Plan moves forward. The goal of this initiative is to provide clear support for the Plan, deliver consistent messages concerning the importance of the Plan, and ensure open and clear communication exists in all SCU policies and procedures.

**The SCU Board of Regents is statutorily responsible for oversight of all campus activities. In 2013, the University’s accrediting agency, the HLC, recommended that the Board become an active member of the Association of Governing Boards (AGB). The AGB recommends that Board members develop a better understanding of their responsibility for educational quality and become more engaged in institutional conversations about learning outcomes.**

The HLC further states an expectation that:

* Board policies and practices document the board’s focus on the organization’s mission.
* The board enables the organization’s chief administrative personnel to exercise effective leadership.
* Board members routinely champion institutional and other improvement efforts that are based on assessment findings.
* Board members advocate the continual improvement of student learning as an institutional priority.
* A governing board possesses and exercises the necessary legal power to establish and review the basic policies that govern the institution.
  + The board provides oversight of the institution’s finances as well as its academic and business operations.
  + The board is sufficiently autonomous from the administration, ownership, and other related entities to assure the integrity of the institution and to allow the board to make decisions in the best interest of the institution.
  + The board authorizes the institution’s affiliation with the Commission.

The SCU Board of Regents is currently reviewing the possibility of becoming a member of the Association of Governing Boards. The Board is also requiring more accountability from the administration of SCU. It’s important that the SCU Board of Regents support SCU assessment activities and the activities required by the HLC if continued accreditation of SCU is desired.

Upper level administrators are also important components in the Academic Improvement Plan. The VPAA and Deans will need to ensure they openly communicate the need for successful implementation of the Plan and that every effort is made to provide adequate resources where and when they are needed. Open, honest, and clear communications will be required at both faculty and President’s Cabinet level.

Shared Governance will be utilized in the program prioritization process to provide the open across- campus dialog necessary as well as provide significant input into the decision making process.

General Education and Curriculum Committee new program and course proposal forms have been revised to ensure that there are required learning outcome statements and/or the associated assessments. By ensuring new programs and courses have appropriate learning outcomes and assessment activities in place in the early stages of their development, the institution can expect better compliance with the current HLC assessment policies.

|  |
| --- |
| *Drafted on: September 2016 – approved by President’s Cabinet* |
| *Policy Revised:* |

Program Prioritization Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Strong**  **4** | **Moderate**  **3** | **Low**  **2** | **No Evidence**  **1** |
| Mission | *Consistency*  *with university mission and vision*    *Reason for*  *the programs*  *existence* | Program clearly demonstrates a **strong** and direct link to SCU’s mission, vision, and strategic goals by making a **convincing** case for its essentiality to the university. | Program demonstrates a **substantial** link to SCU’s mission, vision, and strategic goals by making a **somewhat convincing** case for its essentiality to the university. | Program demonstrates a **partial** link to SCU’s mission, vision, and strategic goals by making a **less than convincing** case for its essentiality to the university. | Program demonstrates **little or no** link to SCU’s mission, vision, and strategic goals and makes **no** case for its essentiality to the university. |
| Demand | *Internal and external demand for the program*  *Future outlook/trends for graduates* | Enrollment in the program, current trends and the US job opportunities outlook indicate that demand for this program will be **strong** in the foreseeable future | Enrollment in the program, current trends and the US job opportunities outlook indicate that demand for this program will be **moderate** in the foreseeable future | Enrollment in the program, current trends and the US job opportunities outlook indicate that demand for this program will be **low** in the foreseeable future | Enrollment in the program, current trends and the US job opportunities outlook indicate **little or no evidence** of demand for this program. |
| Diversity | *Influence on climate; Diversity of courses and curriculum; Diversity of faculty, staff and students, Commitment to diversity in general* | The program shows **strong** evidence of promoting and nurturing a multicultural and socially just climate through its curriculum, recruiting and retention practices, and other formal and informal ways. | The program shows **moderate** evidence of promoting and nurturing a multicultural and socially just climate through its curriculum, recruiting and retention practices, and other formal and informal ways. | The program shows **weak** evidence of promoting and nurturing a multicultural and socially just climate through its curriculum, recruiting and retention practices, and other formal and informal ways. | The program shows **little or no** evidence of promoting and nurturing a multicultural and socially just climate through its curriculum, recruiting and retention practices, and other formal and informal ways. |
| Quality | *Faculty & Accreditation*  *Curriculum: Accreditation and Interdisciplinary* | Program shows **strong** evidence of high quality of faculty and curriculum, enriched interdisciplinary learning and teaching, and is aligned with national accrediting standards (if applicable). | Program shows **moderate** evidence of high quality of faculty and curriculum, enriched interdisciplinary learning and teaching, and is aligned with national accrediting standards (if applicable). | Program shows **weak** evidence of high quality of faculty and curriculum, enriched interdisciplinary learning and teaching, and is aligned with national accrediting standards (if applicable). | Program shows **little or no** evidence of high quality of faculty and curriculum, enriched interdisciplinary learning and teaching, and is aligned with national accrediting standards (if applicable). |
| *Learning outcomes assessment*  *Student Outcomes*  *Retention* | Program outcomes are of **excellent quality**, as indicated by the following:   1. Assessable SLO’s 2. Assessment data indicating that the SLOs are being met 3. Retention and graduation rates 4. Post-graduate achievement | Program outcomes are of **substantial quality**, as indicated by the following:   1. Assessable SLO’s 2. Assessment data indicating that the SLOs are being met 3. Retention and graduation rates 4. Post-graduate achievement | Program outcomes are of **marginally acceptable**, as indicated by the following:   1. Assessable SLO’s 2. Assessment data indicating that the SLOs are being met 3. Retention and graduation rates 4. Post-graduate achievement | Program outcomes are of **low quality**, as indicated by the following:   1. Assessable SLO’s 2. Assessment data indicating that the SLOs are being met 3. Retention and graduation rates 4. Post-graduate achievement |