

## Program Prioritization Undergraduate Rubrics

**Blue** = data provided centrally

**Gold** = data provided by Department Heads

Category 1 Strategic Plan	1	2	3	4	5
Alignment between program and UMD's six Strategic Planning Goals	No clear alignment with any of UMD's strategic plan goals	Clearly aligned with one of UMD's strategic plan goals	Clearly aligned with two of UMD's strategic plan goals	Clearly aligned with three of UMD's strategic plan goals	Clearly aligned with four or more of UMD's strategic plan goals
Cite specific examples, maximum 2000 characters					

Category 2A External Demand	1	2	3	4	5
Enrollment trends over the last 10 years	Lowest 20 percent of programs	second-lowest 20 percent of programs	Median 20 percent of programs	Second-highest 20 percent of programs	Highest 20 percent of programs

Data provided by Institutional Research

Category 2B External Demand	1	2	3	4	5
Percent of UMD undergraduate population (fall 2003 and fall 2012)	Lowest 20 percent of programs	second-lowest 20 percent of programs	Median 20 percent of programs	Second-highest 20 percent of programs	Highest 20 percent of programs

Data provided by Institutional Research

Category 2C External Demand	1	2	3	4	5
Enrollment Outlook Rating Report	Potentially Unfavorable	Mixed/Unclear	Steady	Potentially Favorable	Favorable

Data provided by Hanover Research

<b>Category 2:</b> Space for optional commentary to provide context for reviewers. (300 characters)	
--	--

<b>Category 3A Internal Demand</b>	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Induced course load matrix (2 parts):</i> percentage of lower- and upper-division student credit hours serving non-majors, past 3 years	Lowest 20 percent of programs	second-lowest 20 percent of programs	Median 20 percent of programs	Second-highest 20 percent of programs	Highest 20 percent of programs

Data provided by Institutional Research

<b>Category 3B Internal Demand</b>
<i>Double majors:</i> number of students in a program with an additional major, average over past 3 years (not scored)

Data provided by Institutional Research

<b>Category 3:</b> Space for optional commentary to provide context for reviewers. (300 characters)	
--	--

<b>Category 4A Program Inputs</b>	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Faculty stability:</i> 3-year average of	Lowest 20 percent of programs	second-lowest 20 percent of programs	Median 20 percent of programs	Second-highest 20 percent of programs	Highest 20 percent of programs

percentage FTE provided by regular faculty					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Workload data provided by Institutional Research; workload attribution to program done by department heads.

<b>Category 4B Program Inputs</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Faculty stability:</i> 3-year average of percentage FTE provided by long-term faculty*	Lowest 20 percent of programs	second-lowest 20 percent of programs	Median 20 percent of programs	Second-highest 20 percent of programs	Highest 20 percent of programs

\*"Long-term" is defined as regular faculty and non-regular faculty contributing to a department over a 3 year or more time period. Workload data provided by Institutional Research; workload attribution to program done by department heads.

<b>Category 4C Program Inputs</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Student metrics:</i> Average ACT composite from undergraduate 2011-2 program graduates	Lowest 20 percent of programs	second-lowest 20 percent of programs	Median 20 percent of programs	Second-highest 20 percent of programs	Highest 20 percent of programs

Data provided by Institutional Research

<b>Category 4D: Program Inputs</b> Total number of staff (department level)					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Number to include all AFSCME, Civil Service, and P&A (non-teaching) staff, funded by University dollars (not grant-funded or other external funding). This number should not include student staff.

<b>Category 4D Program</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
--------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

<b>Inputs</b>					
Number of students per professional staff	Highest 20 percent of programs	Second-highest 20 percent of programs	Median 20 percent of programs	Second-lowest 20 percent of programs	Lowest 20 percent of programs

<b>Category 4:</b> Space for optional commentary to provide context for reviewers. (300 characters)	
--	--

<b>Category 5A Equipment &amp; Facilities</b>	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Adequacy of equipment</i>	Equipment is severely sub-standard and/or inadequate for needs	Equipment is sub-standard and/or inadequate for needs	Equipment is standard for needs	Equipment is above standard and/or adequate for needs	Equipment is exceptionally above standard and/or adequate for needs

<b>Category 5B Equipment &amp; Facilities</b>	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Adequacy of facilities</i>	Facilities are severely sub-standard and/or inadequate for needs	Facilities are sub-standard and/or inadequate for needs	Facilities are standard for needs	Facilities are above standard and/or adequate for needs	Facilities are exceptionally above standard and/or adequate for needs

<b>Category 5:</b> Space for optional commentary to provide context for reviewers. (300 characters)	
--	--

<b>Category 6A: Quality of Program Outcomes</b>	1	2	3	4	5

Evidence of assessment for improvement: results from peer review rubrics (2011 and 2012) and assessment plan for the three year 2013-2016 assessment cycle.	No evidence provided. No or out of date assessment plan and no assessment rubric from the peer review.	Program assessment plan in place but no evidence of participation Peer Review (rubric).	Clear evidence of student learning assessment for improvement including an up to date assessment plan, demonstrated participation in peer review process and 1 area "at standard" on peer review rubric.	Clear evidence of student learning assessment for improvement including an up to date assessment plan, demonstrated participation in peer review process and 2 areas "at standard" on peer review rubric.	Clear evidence of student learning assessment for improvement including an up to date assessment plan, demonstrated participation in peer review process and 3 or more areas "at standard" on peer review rubric.
---	--	---	--	---	---

<b>Category 6B Program Inputs</b>	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Placement Information:</i> percentage of students indicating that they have found employment or undertaken additional education, average over past 3 years	Lowest 20 percent of programs	second-lowest 20 percent of programs	Median 20 percent of programs	Second-highest 20 percent of programs	Highest 20 percent of programs

Data provided by Career Services

<b>Category 6C Program Inputs*</b>	Less than 10%	Approx. 11-35%	Approx. 36-50%	Approx. 51-75%	Over 75%
Internships/community engagement					
International education					
Seminars/capstone courses					
Directed research/UROP					

\*Percentage of students within a program that participate in enriching experiences as defined by the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

<b>Category 6D</b>	1	2	3	4	5
--------------------	---	---	---	---	---

<b>Program Inputs</b>					
Evidence of program review or accreditation process	No program review or accreditation process	Program review or accreditation showed significant concerns	Program review or accreditation showed that they met expectations with some concerns	Program review or accreditation showed that they met expectations with no concerns	Program review or accreditation showed that they exceeded expectations
If applicable, briefly list concerns (300 character limit).					

<b>Category 6:</b> Space for optional commentary to provide context for reviewers. (300 characters)	
--	--

<b>Category 7: Size &amp; Scope</b> Average FTE by program over the past 3 years	
---	--

<b>Category 7A: Size &amp; Scope</b>	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Number of majors per FTE, median number over past 3 years</i>	Lowest 20 percent of programs	Second-lowest 20 percent of programs	Median 20 percent of programs	Second-highest 20 percent of programs	Highest 20 percent of programs

Data provided by Institutional Research

<b>Category 7B: Size &amp; Scope</b>	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Number of graduates per FTE, median number over the past 3 years</i>	Lowest 20 percent of programs	Second-lowest 20 percent of programs	Median 20 percent of programs	Second-highest 20 percent of programs	Highest 20 percent of programs

Data provided by Institutional Research

<b>Category 7C:</b>	1	2	3	4	5
---------------------	---	---	---	---	---

Size & Scope					
Student credit hours: per FTE, median number over the past 3 years	Lowest 20 percent of programs	Second-lowest 20 percent of programs	Median 20 percent of programs	Second-highest 20 percent of programs	Highest 20 percent of programs

Data provided by Institutional Research

<b>Category 7:</b> Space for optional commentary to provide context for reviewers. (300 characters)	
--	--

**Category 8: Research/Creative activity**

*This category is to be assessed at the department level, not the program level.*

A. Department heads to summarize the highest priority items in the research/creative activity section of your 7.12. (1000 character limit)

B. 3-year total number of:	Regional	National	International
Presentations/performances/exhibitions			
Books			
Peer-reviewed journal articles			
Other (example: civic engagement, consulting, etc.)			

C. Provide a brief bulleted list of major accomplishments over the past 3 years. (500 characters)

Rubric will be evaluated independently by the PPC and Deans.

Category 8	1	2	3	4	5
Research /creative activity	No or limited activity	Program has activity but is below expectations as outlined in 7.12's	Program expectations have been met as outlined in the 7.12's	Program expectations have been exceeded as outlined in 7.12's	Program expectations have been <u>far</u> exceeded as outlined in 7.12's

<b>Category 8:</b>	
--------------------	--

Space for optional commentary to provide context for reviewers. (300 characters)	
--	--

Category 9A Revenue/Other Resources Generated	1	2	3	4	5
Tuition: past 3 years	Lowest 20 percent of programs	Second-lowest 20 percent of programs	Median 20 percent of programs	Second-highest 20 percent of programs	Highest 20 percent of programs

Included in Cost of Instruction data

Category 9B Revenue/Other Resources Generated	1	2	3	4	5
Department level non-tuition revenue, past 3 years	Lowest 20 percent of programs	Second-lowest 20 percent of programs	Median 20 percent of programs	Second-highest 20 percent of programs	Highest 20 percent of programs

Data provided by Institutional Research

<b>Category 9:</b> Space for optional commentary to provide context for reviewers. (300 characters)	
--	--

Category 10 Costs/Other Expenses	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Cost per student credit hour</i> : past 3 years	Highest 20 percent of programs	Second-highest 20 percent of programs	Median 20 percent of programs	Second-lowest 20 percent of programs	Lowest 20 percent of programs

Included in Cost of Instruction data

<b>Category 10:</b> Space for optional commentary to provide context for	
---	--



reviewers. (300  
characters)

**Category 11: History and Development of the Program (2000 character limit)**

- a) Describe the evolution of your program.
- b) What unique niche does your program fill at UMD and/or in Minnesota?
- c) Does your program have a national or international reputation or a high degree of visibility?
- d) How has your program adapted to changes in technology, student populations, employer needs, and/or trends within your discipline

**Category 12: Opportunity Analysis of the Program (3000 character limit)**

- a) What are the potentials for future growth/change/adaptability of program?
- b) What plans, if any, are there to make changes to the program to improve quality, efficiency, and student experience in the program in the future?
- c) In what ways would additional resources be beneficial to the program?