**Program Prioritization Forum III**

Vicki Szabo presented a Power Point presentation that will be posted on the Program Prioritization Website as well. The committee will not release the Phase 2 results until the process is complete. This will be completed in May.

For Phase 2 programs have two options:

1) Meet with task force on April 18 or 19 (we are in the process of scheduling those appointments – must be scheduled by Monday, April 15th). Department heads and program directors are invited to attend. The hope is that the conversation will be shaped by optional responses guided by the three questions provided.

2) Optional written response. The committee would prefer to have additional data.

Three universal questions – after much discussion the task force decided not to individualize questions. We want programs to respond to what they have done to date. Vicki reviewed the three questions.

Phase 2 data – The task force asked Larry Hammer to provide information on course histories of major courses in programs regarding enrollment. It is very expensive to have several upper level courses that are not well attended. We are in the process of gathering that data. A five-year enrollment data set will be provided as early as Friday, April 5th or it could be Monday, April 8th. This information is readily available and likely department heads already have it.

Timeline - In late April, the task force will produce final recommendations, final categorizations, finalized comments, and for programs remaining in Category 3 a resource adjustment, reorganization, or phased elimination. The task force will meet on April 22nd and 29th to finalize. In May final recommendations will be submitted to the Chancellor and will be made available to all via email and posts on the Program Prioritization Website. The task force will not provide the Chancellor with anything different than what we are providing publicly.

**Q:** For course histories, cross listed courses, will that combined data be shown? **A:** It does not show them as combined totals.

**Q:** Can you define sustainability? **A:** There is no magic number we are looking for because of the variety of programs. We will look at trajectories, changes, and potential for growth. The university defines low enrolled courses (5 for graduate, 10 upper division, and 15 lower division).

For the minors process, we had two data points – number enrolled and number graduated. The task force put most emphasis on the narrative.

**Q:** Cost effectiveness in program – on data points we were using, only cost effectiveness is dealing with SCH. No where have we taken how much people make, basically how much does a graduate cost. **A:** We did eliminate because of too much redundancy and dispute over validity of this data. Provide us with any data you think it would be help us to see – any new information you can provide. These are questions that were not answered for us in the first round. If you can explain to us your program costs, that is what we need.

**Q:** Are we comparing programs against programs in the university or compared against another university in the system? **A:** You need to explain what it costs to have a program like yours – if it makes sense to compare that to other programs across the state, do so. We recognize one data point on cost effectiveness does not tell us the whole story.

**Q:** How did the minors come into the process? **A:** Minors were always intended to be part of the process. Initially we were having difficultly discerning data we could use. The Office of the Provost wanted minors included as there is no other assessment of these stand alone minors. It was difficult to determine what those stand alone minors are – they are not looked at for review in any other process. This has brought some things to light. **C:** We think it was inappropriate to include minors in this way when there has never been any conversation and review of minors to date. **C:** This is the second time we have gone through program prioritization in a three year period; every college did it differently. Minors should not have been included because we did not have time to prepare for this.

**Q:** Can you explain why you are not publishing the results you have right now? **A:** We are not releasing raw data until it can be reviewed and put into a report. We do not want to share the categorizations until review of 3’s is complete.

**Q:** Can deans come to the meetings on April 18 and 19? Will it be a public forum? **A:** We will take that under consideration. Concrete issues will be of value as we complete this process.

**Q:** How will the process go forward after submitting the report to the Chancellor? **A:** Category 1 programs could receive funds from category 3 programs that are phased out. For 3’s, recommendations will go to the Chancellor. We do not know what his process will be from there. Likely he will gather additional information. The process is out of the hands of the task force at that point.

**Q:** At the onset of this process, it was said this was not about money. **A:** At the end of this process, funding for category 1’s from category 3’s was not shared initially. We have no control over funds. As the process has moved forward, there are no funds to invest, therefore the only investment funds available would be those recouped from elimination of category 3’s. Category 1 will be long range investment – we don’t expect the state to provide additional funding, more likely our base budget will be cut. If something is realized and a program is phased out over time, it does not automatically mean a category 1 will receive funding. That is out of the hands of this task force. That is really not a function of our committee. Any phasing out will happen over time.

**Q:** The metric or rubric that was used - can we see that? **A:** We can make that public. All of this information is on the H-drive and has been public for some time.

**C:** I want to thank this committee for the work you have done. I know this has been a difficult process.

**Q:** Sustainability is an issue – are there any resources for new programs? **A:** That has not been part of this process.

**Q:** Is there any consideration for a program’s centrality to the university – like chemistry program. We can’t teach any more people if we don’t get more resources. We can’t graduate nurses, engineering students, etc. **A:** We put a great deal of emphasis on narratives and considered it very carefully utilizing a balance of review between qualitative and quantitative. The task force looked at the health of programs, not its service to other programs, but the health of the program in and of itself. We are not just talking about money here. Someone needs to mind the store and the Provost asked this group to take on that task. This was to provide information to the Provost regarding lots of decisions that need to be made to move forward – to assist with reallocation of faculty, overstaffed and understaffed. If you look at programs that were in Category 3, class sizes were consistently single digits, majors that have graduated a handful of people in five years. This is why they need a further look.

**Q:** Will there be a time where the university can do this process better? **A:** That will definitely be one of the parts of our report. It is important to note the task force has received zero feedback from campus through the electronic mechanism provided, which is disheartening. But this group will have recommendations for future task forces that will be in the final report.

**Q:** The new data point re class enrollment presents frustration for those of us in the arts because they are traditionally smaller classes for a variety of reasons. We have been told by previous regimes this is why we teach a 4/4 rather than a 3/3. We also teach many classes with no compensation. We were told if we put in large classes that would offset small classes. We have been charged to manage SCH’s. This is how we have guided our decisions. **A:** The task force will not look at this data point as the ultimate. Some things done in the past will not be good to do going forward. There are lessons to be learned here. For department heads, if someone wants to teach a course section with one person that will ultimately hurt you.

If there are any questions about specific programs, feel free to email Vicki with those.