

ACADEMIC PROGRAM PRIORITIZATION TASK FORCE

CRITERIA SCORING GUIDELINES

	1 <i>The evidence provided suggests a significant weakness within this category.</i>	2 <i>The evidence provided suggests a cause for concern within this category.</i>	3 <i>The evidence provided suggests an average level within this category.</i>	4 <i>The evidence provided suggests strong performance within this category.</i>	5 <i>The evidence provided suggests exemplary performance within this category.</i>
Criterion 1 (5%): History, Development and Expectations	Little to no key accomplishments, declining program, no prospects for future growth.	Program profile entirely in the past, present program seems stagnant.	Modest accomplishments, uncertain present direction, program has tended to unfold with little planning.	Some notable past accomplishments, viable current program, some prospects for future growth.	Distinguished history, dynamic ongoing initiatives, solid prospects for future growth.
Criterion 2 (11%): External Demand Academic Programs	Little or no evidence of demand for entrance to the program or demand for its graduates.	Low demand for entrance to the program and/or low demand for its graduates. These low rates are likely to remain stable or decrease.	Moderate demand for entrance to the program and/or moderate demand for its graduates. These moderate rates are likely to remain stable.	High demand for entrance to the program and/or high demand for its graduates. These high rates are likely to remain stable or increase.	Very high demand for entrance to the program and very high demand for its graduates. These very high rates are likely to remain stable or increase.
Research Programs and Centres	Little or no evidence of current or anticipated external demand for this research program or centre.	Low evidence of current or anticipated external demand for this research program or centre.	Moderate evidence of current or anticipated external demand for this research program or centre.	Strong evidence of current or anticipated external demand for this research program or centre.	Very strong evidence of current or anticipated external demand for this research program or centre.

	1 <i>The evidence provided suggests a significant weakness within this category.</i>	2 <i>The evidence provided suggests a cause for concern within this category.</i>	3 <i>The evidence provided suggests an average level within this category.</i>	4 <i>The evidence provided suggests strong performance within this category.</i>	5 <i>The evidence provided suggests exemplary performance within this category.</i>
Criterion 3 (10%): Internal Demand Academic Programs	The program offerings are not needed to support other academic program requirements or options.	The program provides little service teaching and includes few offerings that are required or optional for other programs.	The program provides a moderate amount of service teaching and includes some offerings that are required or optional for other programs.	The program provides a high amount of service teaching and includes some offerings that are required or optional for other programs.	The program provides a very high amount of service teaching and/or includes offerings that are required or optional for a variety of other programs.
	Research Programs and Centres	Little or no evidence of demand for this research program or centre within the University.	Low evidence of demand for this research program or centre within the University.	Moderate evidence of demand for this research program or centre within the University.	Strong evidence of demand for this research program or centre within the University.
Criterion 4 (12%): Size, Scope and Productivity	Very low enrolments, few majors produced, very low teaching activity, very low research, scholarly, and/or artistic productivity.	Low enrolments, low teaching activity, low research, scholarly, and/or artistic productivity, given the size of the faculty.	Moderate enrolments; moderate teaching activity, moderate research, scholarly, and/or artistic productivity.	High enrolments; high teaching activity, high research, scholarly, and/or artistic productivity.	Critical mass of highly productive faculty, very high enrolments in both majors and non-majors. Very high research, scholarly, and/or artistic productivity.

	1 <i>The evidence provided suggests a significant weakness within this category.</i>	2 <i>The evidence provided suggests a cause for concern within this category.</i>	3 <i>The evidence provided suggests an average level within this category.</i>	4 <i>The evidence provided suggests strong performance within this category.</i>	5 <i>The evidence provided suggests exemplary performance within this category.</i>
Criterion 5 (6%): Quality of Inputs	Little or no evidence of faculty awards/recognition; very low entering student averages and little or no evidence of student awards/scholarships; program quality is severely limited due to inadequate facilities; no or few initiatives to improve quality have been undertaken in the last three years.	Low evidence of faculty awards/recognition; low entering student averages and low evidence of student awards/scholarships; program quality is limited due to inadequate facilities; few initiatives to improve quality have been undertaken in the last three years.	Moderate evidence of faculty awards/recognition; moderate entering student averages and moderate evidence of student awards/scholarships; the program has access to adequate facilities; some initiatives to improve quality have been undertaken in the last three years.	Strong evidence of faculty awards/recognition; high entering student averages and strong evidence of student awards/scholarships; the program has access to good facilities; evidence of enhanced program quality in the last three years.	Very strong evidence of faculty awards/recognition; very high entering student averages and very strong evidence of student awards/scholarships; the program has access to superior facilities; evidence of enhanced program quality in the last three years.

	1 <i>The evidence provided suggests a significant weakness within this category.</i>	2 <i>The evidence provided suggests a cause for concern within this category.</i>	3 <i>The evidence provided suggests an average level within this category.</i>	4 <i>The evidence provided suggests strong performance within this category.</i>	5 <i>The evidence provided suggests exemplary performance within this category.</i>
Criterion 6 (18%): Quality of Outcomes	<p>Notable deficiencies in accreditation, other program reviews, or comparisons with similar programs.</p> <p>The program shows little or no faculty success in research, scholarly or artistic output and little or no student success, as measured by such things as engagement surveys, graduation rates, hire rates, or tendency to pursue further studies in the program discipline, over the three year time period.</p>	<p>Weaknesses noted in accreditation, other program reviews, or comparisons with similar programs.</p> <p>The program shows either some faculty success in research, scholarly or artistic output or some student success, as measured by such things as engagement surveys, graduation rates, hire rates, or tendency to pursue further studies in the program discipline, over the three year time period.</p>	<p>No weaknesses noted in accreditation, other program reviews, or comparisons with similar programs.</p> <p>The program shows faculty success in research, scholarly or artistic output, with output steady or increasing over the three year time period. The program also shows student success on at least some relevant measures over the three year time period, or an improving trend in that time.</p>	<p>Some strengths noted in accreditation, other program reviews, or comparisons with similar programs.</p> <p>The program shows marked faculty success in research, scholarly or artistic output. Output has been steady or increasing over the three year time period, and is of consistently high quality. The program also shows student success on most relevant measures over the three year time period, or an improving trend in that time.</p>	<p>Extensive strengths noted in accreditation, other program reviews, or comparisons with similar programs.</p> <p>The program shows exemplary faculty success in research, scholarly or artistic output. Output has been increasing and is of consistently of very high quality. The program also shows exemplary student success on all or most relevant measures over the three year time period, or a marked improvement in that time.</p>

	1 <i>The evidence provided suggests a significant weakness within this category.</i>	2 <i>The evidence provided suggests a cause for concern within this category.</i>	3 <i>The evidence provided suggests an average level within this category.</i>	4 <i>The evidence provided suggests strong performance within this category.</i>	5 <i>The evidence provided suggests exemplary performance within this category.</i>
Criterion 7 (10%): Revenue and Resources	The total revenue generated is far below the prorated median revenue generation. ¹	The total revenue generated is below the prorated median revenue generation.	The total revenue generated approximately equals the prorated median revenue generation.	The total revenue generated is above the prorated median revenue generation.	The total revenue generated is well above the prorated median revenue generation.
Criterion 8 (8%): Costs and Expenses	Both cost categories (i.e., Salary total, Direct Costs total) substantially exceed the prorated median level of these costs. ²	One of the cost categories substantially exceeds the prorated median level of these costs.	The costs are approximately equal to the prorated median level of costs within each category.	One of the cost categories is substantially lower than the prorated median level of these costs.	Both cost categories are substantially lower than the prorated median level of these costs.

¹ Prorated median level of revenue generation = median of Total Department Revenue (all departments across university) x % of resources attributed to program under review. The median of Total Department Revenue would be provided centrally, and this calculation could be included on the template. This calculation would put revenue generation into a university-wide comparative context and would provide a common standard for scoring.

² Cost Categories: Salary & Benefits; Non-Salary Direct Costs. Prorated median level of salary costs = median level of Total Salaries & Benefits (provided centrally) x % salary attributed to program under review. Prorated median level of non-salary direct costs = median level of Total Non-Salary Direct Costs (provided centrally) x % salary attributed to program under review.

	1	2	3	4	5
	<i>The evidence provided suggests a significant weakness within this category.</i>	<i>The evidence provided suggests a cause for concern within this category.</i>	<i>The evidence provided suggests an expected level within this category.</i>	<i>The evidence provided suggests strong performance within this category.</i>	<i>The evidence provided suggests exemplary performance within this category.</i>
Criterion 9 (14%): Impact, Justification, and Overall Essentiality	Program is strategically marginal, has low visibility, and makes little attempt to connect with the rest of the University or stakeholders external to the university.	Program is uneven, with only some points of contact with stakeholders external to the university and /or alignment with only one key strategic initiative.	Program is active and vibrant, though not visibly aligned with strategic directions and with modest connections to stakeholders external to the university.	Program is either very well aligned strategically, or very well connected with stakeholders external to the university.	Program is well aligned with University’s strategic directions, has strong connections to stakeholders external to the university, and performs a critical role in the delivering the University’s mandate.
Criterion 10 (6%): Opportunity Analysis	Little or no potential for reconfiguration and alignment with strategic directions. Little or no potential for finding opportunities for greater efficiency or collaboration.	Some potential for reconfiguration and alignment with strategic directions. Some potential for finding opportunities for greater efficiency or collaboration.	Moderate potential for reconfiguration and alignment with strategic directions. Moderate potential for finding opportunities for greater efficiency or collaboration.	Strong potential for reconfiguration and alignment with strategic directions. Strong potential for finding opportunities for greater efficiency or collaboration.	Very strong potential for reconfiguration and alignment with strategic directions. Very strong potential for reconfiguration and alignment with strategic directions.