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Executive Summary

In response to the growing concern about declining graduate admissions and enrollments, the President and Provost in the Fall Semester 2012 requested of the recently appointed Interim Dean of Graduate Studies (The Dean) that the School of Graduate Studies conduct a process to prioritize the University’s graduate programs. The President also announced this intention to the Board of Regents and the System Leadership.

The Dean moved to implement a program prioritization process. This included appointing a committee to engage in the process and identifying a format for conducting such a process. The Program Prioritization Committee (The Committee) was comprised of five academic administrators, The Interim Dean of Graduate Studies as well as the Deans of the four Schools or a designee; 15 faculty, the Chair of the Graduate Council, three representatives from each school, the faculty senate president, and the AAUP contract administrator; along with four Administrative Staff, the Controller, an analyst from the Controller’s Office, the Director of the Office of Management and Institutional Research and the Director of the Office of Assessment and Planning. The format developed by Dickeson (Dickeson, 2010) was identified as the most well developed method for conducting the program prioritization. Two subcommittees of The Committee were charged with identifying the various data and narrative items to be included under each of the 10 prioritization criteria. A third subcommittee was charged with developing the prioritization categories, working on the rankings and weights, and developing the initial scoring rubric. The need for criteria rankings and weights is highlighted
by Dickeson (2010) as being essential so that when programs are prioritized, the prioritization reflects the mission and values of the institution.

A series of Town Hall meetings was held to introduce the process to the University Community; to apprise the University Community of the data and narrative elements that were likely to be included in the reports; and to introduce the reporting process to the University Community. Moreover, a guide, *Advice*, was developed and posted to the Program Prioritization website, along with pilot program prioritization reports as models to assist in writing the reports. The mechanisms were established for both the electronic submission of and scoring of reports by The Committee. In early May 2014, The Committee met to review the prioritization scores for each program and to make final prioritization recommendations.

The Committee assigned eight programs to Prioritization Category 1. These programs are recommended for expansion of enrollments with increased resources to address the expanded enrollments. Included programs are: Social Work; Communication Disorders; Clinical Counseling (MS); School Psychology (MS); Creative Writing; School Counseling (MS); Public Health; and TESOL.

Eight programs were assigned to Prioritization Category 2. These programs may best be seen as being deserving of additional resources to address current program enrollments and demand. Included programs are: Psychology; School Psychology (6th Year); Special Education (MS); Clinical Counseling (6th Year);
Education (MS); Environmental Education (MS); Math Education; and Nursing (MS).

The Committee assigned 12 programs to Category 3. These programs are seen as adequately enrolled, likely at or near demand capacity, and adequately supported. Included programs are: Women’s Studies; Recreation & Leisure Studies; Romance Languages; Business Administration; Marriage and Family Therapy; Political Science; English; Reading (MS & 6th Year); History; Educational Leadership (EdD); and Computer Science.

The Committee assigned four programs to Category 4. These programs are seen as having the right size enrollment, but likely are assigned more resources than needed. Appropriate steps should be taken to align resources with enrollments. Included programs are: Exercise Science; Science Education (MS and 6th Year); and Educational Leadership (6th year).

Finally, The Committee assigned nine programs to Category 5. While the reasons that these programs were assigned to this category vary, the result is that these programs are seen as having significantly more resources than appropriate for program enrollment. Included programs are: Biology; Chemistry; Sociology; Library Science (MLS & 6th Year); Special Education (6th Year); Educational Coach (6th Year); Classroom Teacher Specialist (6th Year); School Health Education; and Art Education. The Committee believes that eight of these programs either need to be significantly restructured, revamped, and/or combined in an appropriate time frame or ultimately engaged in the appropriate process under the Collective Bargaining
Agreement for phase out. The Committee determined that the Art Education program was already at the point where the appropriate action would be to begin the process of phasing it out.

It should be noted that because of their recent addition to the Graduate programs of the University, the MS in Applied Physics and the EdD in Nursing Education were excluded from the prioritization process. These programs do need to be monitored to ensure that they meet the projections established for them when they were approved by the Board of Regents.

From the outset of this process, beginning with the first Town Hall meeting, the University Community was promised the opportunity to respond and comment on the draft report prior to the final report being issued. It was indicated that this opportunity would be through a Town Hall meeting that would be held as soon as practicable after the draft report was written. This Town Hall meeting was held on September 19, 2014. At that meeting the recommendations of the Committee were presented to the University Community. Additionally, a possible process for moving forward post prioritization was presented. The presentation is included as part of Appendix C. In early December, a website was established along with a dedicated email address to allow for comments and or rebuttal documents to be submitted to the Dean of Graduate Studies. The understanding at the time of the Town Hall meeting was that these comments and documents would be an additional appendix to the Final Report, and they are attached as Appendix E. This report is submitted as the final product of the Program Prioritization Committee.
I. Introduction

In Academic Year 2009 – 2010, Southern Connecticut State University (Southern) experienced a significant downturn in the number of applicants to and the number of students enrolled in its Graduate Programs. This downturn was seen as unusual, since national trends in graduate school show that enrollments typically rise during times of economic downturn. The current recession indicated a very different trend. It was noted that nationally new graduate enrollments were generally down 1.1 percent (Jane, 2011). At Southern the downturn in new and continuing enrollments clearly exceeded this national trend. These losses continued in Academic Year 2010 – 2011, and 2011 – 2012.

It was apparent that addressing these declining enrollments would require simultaneous review of all graduate programs with the express purpose of ensuring an appropriate distribution of resources across programs, defined by Dickeson (2010) as Program Prioritization. With the change in University leadership, including the appointment of an Interim Dean of Graduate Studies (The Dean) in August 2012, the opportunity to engage in program prioritization seemed opportune. In October 2012, President Papazian announced first at a cabinet meeting and then later that month at a Board of Regents meeting that the School of Graduate Studies would engage in program prioritization.

These announcements began a series of discussions between the Provost and The Dean concerning the timeline in which the program prioritization should occur, as well as about the make-up of The Program Prioritization Committee. It was
determined that the committee should be co-chaired by the two persons most responsible for oversight of graduate programs on campus, the Interim Dean of Graduate Studies, Dr. Gregory Paveza, and the Chair of the Graduate Council, Dr. Christine Petto. Dr. Petto was asked to serve as co-chair, to which she agreed. Additionally, it was decided, based on a review of Dickeson's book on program prioritization (Dickeson, 2010), that the majority of committee members needed to be members of the faculty to lend the greatest legitimacy to final recommendations. This desire for legitimacy set the tone for development of the committee, and for the tone and tenor of the committee as it moved forward.
II. Methodology of the Program Prioritization Process

Formation of the Committee and Initial Deliberations

Given the decision to ensure that the committee was comprised principally of members of the faculty, the Dean was asked to recommend to the Provost and the President members to serve on the Program Prioritization Committee (The Committee). To guarantee equity across all of the academic schools it was determined that each school would have equal representation on the committee. Four persons were selected from each school; the Dean of the School, a graduate program coordinator, a department chair, and a member of the graduate council. To ensure that no single program was over-represented, it was further decided that the three faculty members representing a school should all come from different departments. In addition to the three faculty representatives from each school, it was determined that both the Faculty Senate and the AAUP chapter on campus should be represented on The Committee by their Presidents. The AAUP Chapter President requested, and it was agreed, that he could designate the AAUP Contract Administrator to serve in his place. Also, because of the unique circumstance that the Interim Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and the Dean of the School of Health and Human Services were the same person, it was similarly determined, again in order to maintain equity across schools in terms of representation, that the Associate Dean from the School of Health and Human Services would represent the Dean for that School on The Committee. Finally, four members of various administrative offices were asked to serve on The Committee; these were the
Controller, an Analyst from the Controller's Office, the Director of the Office of Planning and Assessment, and the Director of the Office of Management and Institutional Research. While these four persons were to be fully included in the development of the prioritization process, it was also determined, that they would not participate in the scoring of those reports. This decision was reached by the committee based on the consensus opinion that the scoring of the reports should be the province of the faculty and the Deans. These four persons in combination with the co-chairs are referred to as The Data Group. A list of the initial members of The Committee is contained in Appendix A.

The Committee remained unchanged during the Spring 2013 Academic term, but in the Fall 2013 Academic term several changes occurred. The first addressed the change in presidential leadership in the Faculty Senate. The new Faculty Senate President was asked to replace the retiring Faculty Senate President, and he agreed. At the same time, the Department Chair from Arts and Sciences requested to step down from The Committee. The retiring Faculty Senate President also happened to be a Department Chair in the School of Arts and Sciences, so she was asked to remain on The Committee as the Department Chair from the School of Arts and Sciences. In Education, the Department Chair serving on the Committee had stepped down from that position. He was replaced by the newly appointed Department Chair from the same department. Finally, the long serving Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences had left the University and the newly appointed Dean of
Arts and Sciences took her place on The Committee. The members of The Committee beginning in the Fall 2013 Term are included in Appendix A.

The Committee remained unchanged through most of Academic Year 2013 – 2014, except that in mid-Spring 2014 Term a member of The Committee from the School of Health and Human Services took an extended leave of absence to care for a family member. To ensure that all Schools remained equally represented, and given that scoring of the programs had not yet begun, a replacement was named to fill this vacancy. The final membership list is included in Appendix A.

**Development of the Criteria and Report Elements**

The Committee met for the first time in November 2012 just prior to the end of the semester. This meeting was organizational in nature. The Dean suggested that the work done by Dickeson in the early 2000’s and more recently updated in 2010 (Dickeson, 2010) be used as the general working outline for the prioritization process. He noted that this work had become the generally used reference for guiding program prioritization. He also noted that the process outlined in the book had been used by a growing number of institutions as they engaged in the prioritization process. While there was some discussion about whether Southern should use these same criteria or develop its own, it was pointed out that The Committee was working under a timeline that would require at least a draft report to the President of the University by the close of the 2013 - 2014 Academic Year. It was suggested that it was unlikely that The Committee would be able to meet this timeline if it went through the process of developing its own criteria rather than
using an already developed set of criteria with some track record of success. The Committee reached a consensus that it would use the ten criteria established by Dickeson, and that it would follow the general process laid out in his book on program prioritization, keeping in mind that it would adapt the criteria as needed to the context of SCSU and to the graduate school.

The Committee then divided into three working subcommittees. Each subcommittee consisted of a School Dean, four or five faculty members and one person from The Data Group. The Co-Chairs sat as ex officio members of each of the subcommittees. Each subcommittee was co-chaired by a School Dean and a member of the faculty. The composition of each subcommittee is included in Appendix A. The Subcommittee on Criteria 1 – 5 was to identify the data and narrative elements that would be included for these criteria. The Subcommittee on Criteria 6 – 10 was to identify the data and narrative elements that would be included for these criteria. The Subcommittee on Prioritization Categories was to develop the prioritization categories to which each graduate program would be assigned. It was also charged with developing the ranking of and weights for the criteria and, once the data and narrative elements to be included under each criterion were agreed upon, the scoring rubric for the criteria.

A Town Hall meeting with the Southern Community was held on Friday, November 30, 2012. The intent of that meeting was to introduce the idea of Program Prioritization, its purpose, the general process to be used in the prioritization and the general timeline for completion. The meeting also served as
an opportunity for members of the Southern Community to ask any questions and to raise any concerns about the process. A copy of that Town Hall presentation is included in Appendix C.

With the coming of the Spring 2013 Academic Term, The Committee began its work in earnest. The Committee met on the second and fourth Fridays of each month, while the subcommittees met on the alternating weeks. The Committee and the subcommittees met with their fair share of weather-related closings which slowed the overall development of the data and narrative elements of the criteria. As the first two subcommittees defined the data and narrative elements for each criterion, these elements were brought back to The Committee, discussed and refined.

Also during this period The Committee discussed whether it wanted to alter the format of the criteria and distill the report into just three overarching categories. At the conclusion of the discussion, The Committee decided to retain the ten criteria and to have each program write a report addressing each criterion. By the end of the Spring 2013 semester, The Committee had arrived at an initial set of data and narrative elements for each criterion. A second Town Hall meeting was held on Friday, May 3, 2013, to present these initial criteria elements, criteria rankings, and prioritization categories to the Southern community. A copy of this Town Hall presentation is included in Appendix C.

During the summer of 2013, the Data Team, except for the Faculty Co-Chair who was out of state during this time, met to determine whether the data elements
that had been included for each criterion could in fact be generated. The Data Team also focused on the development of a common revenue and cost model to ensure that all programs reported and discussed the same revenue and cost data. Several critical data issues were identified which resulted in modification to some of the data elements to be included as well as the need to alter some of the narrative elements. It was also during this meeting that an initial discussion took place concerning whether all programs should be required to use and present the same data. The general consensus among this group was that only the data generated by the data team should be included in the program reports to ensure that only officially-reported and generally available data were included in the reports. This was essential for ensuring that all reports were relatively uniform in content and length. At the conclusion of this meeting a revised set of data and narrative elements for each criterion was proposed.

With the coming of the Fall 2013 Academic term, The Committee reconvened with the changes in membership, as noted above. The initial focus of The Committee was to review the revised set of data and narrative elements for each criterion. The revenue and cost model was presented to The Committee, discussed and approved. A copy of the presentation is included in Appendix C. The Committee made some additional changes to the data and narrative elements confirmed that the data elements in particular could be generated, and approved the final set of data and narrative elements for each criterion on December 13, 2013.
In addition, The Committee explored the possible use of an external vendor that would have allowed for both electronic submission of reports by each program, and electronic scoring of each report by each reviewer. The fact that the software itself was still in development, as well as the time it would have taken to obtain an approved contract with the vendor resulted in a decision not to use the vendor.

While the decision not to use the vendor software was the only reasonable decision at the time, it still left The Committee with the task of determining how reports were to be submitted, as well as the format for the reports, including word limits for each narrative section to ensure that reports were approximately the same length. Moreover, the committee also had to determine a method to score the reports and then to analyze the scores so that an initial assignment could be made placing each program into one of the five prioritization categories. Over the remainder of the Fall 2013 term these issues were resolved. A copy of the Program Prioritization Report Outline, including the data and narrative elements to be included in each report, along with words limits for each narrative element, is included in Appendix B.

Development of Prioritization Categories, Assignment of Weights to the Criteria, and Development of the Scoring Rubric

As the first two subcommittees began their work on the data and narrative elements to be included in the Prioritization reports, the subcommittee on Prioritization Categories began developing the categories for program assignment. The subcommittee reviewed Dickeson’s model, made some changes to these
categories to reflect the needs of Southern, and presented the categories to The Committee. The Committee discussed these categories, made some additional modifications, and approved the previously described set of five prioritization categories. These categories are presented in Appendix B.

The subcommittee also engaged in a process with The Committee to determine the ranking of each of the criteria. This was an essential step in the process, since Dickeson (2010) notes that each institution must determine the relative importance of the criteria and the appropriate weights to be assigned to each criterion in order to arrive at a distribution of programs across categories that reflect the values of the institution. The rankings for the criteria were determined by asking each member of The Committee to rank order the criteria according to importance. These individual rankings were then averaged for all members of the Committee. The rankings determined by The Committee after review of the information presented by the subcommittee are reported in Appendix B. These rankings were then used by the subcommittee to develop a set of weights for each criterion. The weights were similarly reviewed and revised by The Committee and are reflected in the Scoring Rubric. The prioritization categories, criteria rankings and weights were part of the presentation at the Spring 2013 Town Hall meeting.

In the Fall 2013 Academic Term, the subcommittee began the critical work of developing the scoring rubric for each criterion. Dean Paveza suggested an initial scoring rubric that would likely result in a distribution of scores that would allow for reasonable assignment of programs to prioritization categories. The
subcommittee as well as The Committee devoted several meetings to developing an acceptable scale and score definitions for each criterion. The Committee ultimately agreed to a five-point scale, with the scoring levels being 1, 3.5, 6, 7.5 and 9. The Committee agreed that this scale would allow the best possible variation to occur among scores once each individual criterion score was multiplied by its weight. The Committee approved the Scoring Rubric at a meeting held on February 10, 2014. A copy of the Scoring Rubric is included in Appendix B.

**Determination of Number of Graduate Programs to Be Reviewed**

Another critical element for discussion during the Spring 2013 Academic Term was a determination of the actual number of graduate programs offered through the School of Graduate Studies, and the degree to which data could be generated for each individual program.

The Committee reviewed a comprehensive list of Graduate Programs. Data anomalies and other critical issues that emerged during discussions resulted in a final list of 41 programs that would be required to provide reports. The single greatest determinate in allowing certain programs to submit a common report for multiple programs was the inability to generate an independent data set for each program housed within a department. An illustration will best exemplify the problem. Students in both the MA in History and the MS in History take many of the same courses. While number of applications can be calculated for each of the programs, other data elements such as credit hours generated by a program could not be calculated. The lack of electronic planned programs does not allow for the
determination of the proportion of students from each program in a course. Thus there is no practical way to determine the distribution of credit hours in a specific course by separate program. The Committee decided that the only reasonable solution when data could not be generated for each program occurring in the same department was to permit those programs to submit a single report.

Writing of the Program Prioritization Reports

By the end of the Fall 2013 Academic Term, The Committee had determined the final set of data and narrative elements for each criterion, the format for the Prioritization Reports, including word limits for each narrative section, and the rankings and weights for each criterion. To determine whether reports could be generated using the agreed-upon data and narrative elements and the reporting format, it was decided to have several programs compose a pilot Program Prioritization Report during the Winter Intersession. The programs that agreed to submit pilot reports were: History, Mathematics, Communication Disorders, and Special Education. Due to some unanticipated issues, Special Education decided not to write a pilot report. Since the pilot reports were to be written during the Intersession and made available by the beginning of the Spring 2014 Academic term, the report writers for the three programs were provided compensation under Article 10.12.1 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Each of the pilot programs was provided with the identified data elements, and asked to use the format for the Prioritization Report and abide by the specified word limits in the narratives. They were also asked to test several different formats for submitting the report. These
pilot reports resulted in some additional modifications to the data to be provided to the programs.

At the Town Hall meeting on January 31, 2014, the report outline was presented to the University community along with guidelines for its completion. A copy of that presentation is presented in Appendix C. Additionally an Advice document was developed by Dr. Jess Gregory, a member of The Committee, to assist in writing the report. A copy of that document is provided in Appendix C. Programs were asked to complete and submit their reports by no later than March 28, 2014. This date was extended to April 1, 2014, given several weather related closings that made it difficult for programs to meet the March 28, 2014, deadline.

Submission and Scoring the Reports

Reports were submitted electronically to the School of Graduate Studies. They were reviewed to ensure that they met the word limits, guaranteeing that no program was unfairly advantaged by writing an extended report. Several reports were sent back to authors for editing as they significantly exceeded the words limits. Once a final report meeting the word limit requirements was received, the report was converted into PDF format and posted to the Program Prioritization website:

http://southernct.edu/academics/graduate/prioritizationreports04112014.html.

Publicly posting the reports ensured full transparency.

Dr. Michael Ben-Avie of the Office of Assessment and Planning began a discussion with Susan Tiso, the TK20 Assessment Program Coordinator after the
final scoring rubric was approved which resulted in the Scoring Rubric being available in TK20 for electronic scoring. A “screen shot” of one of the scoring pages is included in Appendix C. After considerable discussion among the members of The Committee and given the complexity of computing the cost and revenue models, it was agreed that the scoring of Criterion 7 and Criterion 8 would be calculated electronically. Those scores would be entered into the scoring reports for each committee member electronically. Moreover, it was also agreed that the scores for these two criteria would be limited to the three principle categories, so that scores would be either 1, 6, or 9.

Members of The Committee were asked to complete the scoring of all program prioritization reports by April 28, 2014, to ensure that the composite scores could be compiled in time for the meetings scheduled to discuss the final assignment to prioritization categories on May 5, 2014, and May 7, 2014.
III. Program Prioritization Recommendations

There are several key concepts to keep in mind when reviewing the recommendations of The Committee. The first is that both the data and the narratives provided in the reports are point-in-time assessments. The data were from Academic Years 2010 – 2011, 2011 – 2012 and 2012 – 2013. Thus any changes that a program may have undergone during academic year 2013 – 2014 or the current academic year (2014 – 2015) would not be reflected in the report. The purpose of the narrative for each criterion, and in particular the narratives for Criterion 9 and Criterion 10, was in part to allow programs to address changes that occurred either during the years for which data were provided or during the current academic year.

Another crucial factor to take into account is that, not unlike many other endeavors in the academy, there is an element of subjectivity that entered into the scoring process. For this reason, The Committee agreed early on in the process that all committee members would score all programs. It is also why The Committee agreed that assignment to a prioritization category would not be determined solely by the prioritization score derived from reading of the program reports. Rather, The Committee would discuss the scores and make adjustments to prioritization category assignment, as appropriate. These discussions and final assignments took place during the meetings of The Committee on May 5 and May 7, 2014.

With the foregoing discussion as prelude, what follows are the recommendations of The Committee. The recommendations were made after review
of the Prioritization Scores for each program and discussion by The Committee as to the appropriateness of the initial category assignment based on the programs prioritization score. It is worth noting that after review of initial assignment and careful deliberation all but a few programs were deemed by The Committee to be in the appropriate category as determined by the initial numerical prioritization score. The complete prioritization scoring sheet is provided in Appendix D. For departments that provided reports for multiple programs, the program designation is placed after the program name, e.g., Educational Leadership (EdD).

Category 1 includes those programs that The Committee perceived as candidates for expansion and/or enhancement and increased levels of support. The members of The Committee acknowledged that multiple conversations and negotiations may be necessary as many of these programs are bound by requirements from outside accrediting agencies. As a consequence, an open dialogue between the members of the administration and each program’s faculty will be necessary to assess how best to expand and/or enhance these programs. No program should be forced to expand and put in jeopardy the quality of the program or its accreditation. The eight programs included in Category 1 are: Social Work; Communication Disorders; Clinical Counseling (MS); School Psychology (MS); Creative Writing; School Counseling (MS); Public Health; and TESOL.

Category 2 includes those programs identified as needing to maintain their size but with increased levels of support. These programs are generally seen as having insufficient resources given their current size and the demand for the
program. As with Category 1, separate dialogues between the administration and
the members of the eight programs in this category will be necessary in order to
address how best to implement an increase in resources. The eight programs
included in Category 2 are: Psychology; School Psychology (6th Year); Special
Education (MS); Clinical Counseling (6th Year); Education (MS); Environmental
Education (MS); Math Education; and Nursing (MS).

Category 3 not unexpectedly includes the largest number of programs. This is
the category that comprises programs that are candidates for maintenance in
enrollment size and status quo levels of resources. These programs are generally
perceived as being the right size given current resources and demand. In some
cases, these programs may also be at or near capacity as well as demand for the
program. The twelve programs in Category 3 are: Women’s Studies; Recreation &
Leisure Studies; Romance Languages; Business Administration; Marriage and
Family Therapy; Political Science; English; Reading (MS & 6th Year); History;
Educational Leadership (EdD); and Computer Science.

Category 4 comprises those programs identified to maintain their size but
with a reduction in the level of support. The Committee sees these programs as
being the right size in terms of enrollment and current demand capacity but
currently having a disproportionately high level of resources for the numbers of
students in the program and likely future demand. Appropriate discussions between
faculty and administration should take place to look at how to correct the level of
resource allocation for these programs. The four programs in Category 4 are:
Exercise Science; Science Education (MS and 6th Year); and Educational Leadership (6th year).

Category 5 includes programs for reduction, phasing out, or consolidation. In Committee discussions in May, there was a suggestion to include the concept of revamping or restructuring of programs in this category as well. The nine programs falling within Category 5 are: Biology; Chemistry; Sociology; Library Science (MLS & 6th Year); Special Education (6th Year); Educational Coach (6th Year); Classroom Teacher Specialist (6th Year); School Health Education; and Art Education. The Committee has chosen to be more specific in its recommendation in this category given the various reasons that these programs were assigned to this category. It was recommended that Art Education be phased out. It was recommended that School Health be examined for consolidation with another program possibly in a department outside of its current department. It was recommended that the three Sixth-Year programs, one each in Education and Special Education and one, Educational Coach, shared by Education and Special Education, be examined for consolidation and/or restructuring. The graduate program in Sociology has taken some tentative steps to revamp its program and the Committee urges that a discussion occur between the program and the administration to evaluate the best steps going forward. Given the near completion of the new Science Building, the committee strongly recommends that Biology and Chemistry also be considered for restructuring. The Chemistry program has already taken steps to reconstruct its graduate program and more conversation is required to evaluate their plans for the
future. The Committee is confident that Biology has the opportunity to strengthen its program as well if appropriately restructured, possibly in the direction of a Professional Science Master’s Degree Program. Finally, the two programs in Library Science (MLS, 6th Yr.) are at a critical stage in their existence. With the recent loss of accreditation, it is imperative that the faculty members of the program continue to make progress to reorganize and restructure those programs, with the emphasis on the MLS program and regaining American Library Association (ALA) accreditation. Serious conversations must occur between the program members and the administration to ascertain commitment to reconstruct these two programs. The Committee is cognizant and wants to be clear that the process of revamping, restructuring or reconstructing a program should entail no immediate additional resources; indeed, during this period a reduction in resources might be appropriate and reasonable. Moreover, The Committee believes that any plans put forward by any of the programs in this category to restructure, reconstruct, reorganize or revamp should have specific goals and timelines for attainment of those goals. Should those goals and timelines be met and the program reconstruction demonstrates success, the return of resources or even additional resource allocation might be appropriate. However, should those programs fail to meet their goals and timelines, or should the program fail to put forward to the administration a viable revitalization plan in a timely fashion, The Committee sees it as appropriate to move such programs into the process required for a planned phase out.
It is important to reiterate that two programs, the MS in Applied Physics and the EdD in Nursing Education, both of which are less than three years old and for which no revenue or cost data were available, were not assigned to a Prioritization category. It is noteworthy however, that both of these programs submitted Prioritization Reports for The Committee to review. It is also worth noting that when assessed based on all other data, that the MS in Applied Physics was scored by The Committee as one that should be included in Category 1, and the EdD in Nursing Education was scored as a program that should be included in Category 2. It is imperative that these programs be monitored to ensure that they meet the goals that were set when the programs were approved for implementation.
IV. Concluding Thoughts

From the outset of this process, beginning with the first Town Hall meeting, the University Community was promised the opportunity to respond to and comment on the draft report prior to the final report being issued. It was indicated that this opportunity would be through a Town Hall meeting that would be held as soon as practicable after the draft report was written. A Town Hall meeting was held on September 19, 2014. At that Town Hall the Committee Chairs presented the recommendations of the committee. Additionally, a process for moving forward post prioritization was presented. This process included a website and dedicated email address to allow individuals to offer comments and or programs to provide rebuttal documents to the Committee’s recommendations. These two elements went live in early December 2014. The comments and rebuttal documents are included in Appendix E. Additionally, it was suggested that an implementation committee be appointed that would both review expansion plans from programs in Category I and revitalization plans put forward by programs in Category V.

As we move forward to an ongoing prioritization process, we have seen several steps that the University needs to take to ensure the validity of the process. The Committee wants to note that there were a number of concerns particularly around the ability to generate certain data elements. The fact that many faculty members fail to use Digital Measures for keeping their portfolios up to date makes it nearly impossible to have a common location to obtain information on faculty productivity. We urge the administration to continue to work with faculty leadership to find an
acceptable means of ensuring that there is a common database from which faculty productivity information can be obtained.

Of continuing concern to all is the discrepancy between what departments perceive or track in the area of applications to programs and what the School of Graduate Studies reports. In many cases it was clear that departments only saw an applicant as an applicant if he/she completed all elements required by the department for consideration. This is very different from how applicants are recorded in the School of Graduate Studies where any application accompanied by the appropriate fee is considered an application to the program. Similarly, many programs consider a student as part of the program as long as the student at some time had registered for a course and did not formally withdraw or graduate. In contrast, from a data perspective, students are only seen as active in a program if they are currently enrolled in a course. This contributes to confusion about who are in fact students in the program and how many students are actually active in the program. This issue will likely be better addressed under the new continuous enrollment policy that requires all graduate students to be continuously enrolled or risk de-matriculation. This new policy should be monitored to verify that departmental counts come into alignment with university enrollment counts.

The lack of a digital planned program for graduate programs, similar to the CAPPS system used for undergraduates, contributes to a difficulty in assigning costs to programs. The degree to which course work in programs overlaps, e.g., the MA in English and the MS in English, means that assignment of revenue is either
done proportionally based on the number of students admitted to each program, or the multiple programs are treated as a single program. A digital planned program would allow for a direct link by program type to the various courses so that credit hours generated by a program as well as revenues and costs could be directly assigned to each program.

The cost and revenue model developed for this process, while well thought out and implemented still requires some refinement. Better mechanisms need to be developed to track both hidden revenue and hidden costs. Most critically in the current process, scoring of the rubric was based on the deviation from the mean revenues and costs for programs. In terms of interpreting costs, external benchmarks will be important for future reviews. While the internal review of costs is essential in understanding the financial impact of a program when compared to all the other programs within the University, an external benchmark will provide a better understanding of the costs of delivering similar programs in comparable settings. Furthermore, external benchmarks will allow for a more appropriate comparison of costs by degree type, i.e., Master’s, 6th Year and Doctoral programs. Both internal and external comparisons are important in affording those reviewing programs the best understanding of the financial impact of the program.

For future evaluations, we see four major issues that need to be addressed. First, the evaluation process requires that all faculty members use Digital Measures in a more consistent way. Second, enrollment data needs to be collected so that departmental numbers are more consistent with graduate school numbers.
Third, planned programs need to be digitized. Fourth, the costing model needs to be refined so that it includes external benchmarks.

This report concludes the work of the Program Prioritization Committee.
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Appendix B
Purpose of Graduate Program Prioritization

Since 2003 part time enrollments have been declining, and for the past 3 years full time enrollments have fallen at SCSU. This is a trend seen across the ComSCU system and the nation (Patton, 2012). With these downward trends in enrollment, schools have been faced with cutting costs. While there once was a time when programs could be left alone, even if they had become bloated with courses that were under-enrolled or under-performing, this is no longer the case. One way to address the reduction in student tuition dollars is to impose across the board cuts that are insensitive to the impacts the cuts will have. This sort of cut damages the school much like bloodletting; intended to improve the health of a patient, actually weakens.

The program prioritization process is a result of lower enrollments, but it also acknowledges that the graduate school has to remain responsive to the needs of students. Through program prioritization, every graduate program will be compared according to a set of criteria. This process can identify shining stars that need more resources and programs that may need more attention, but may not need the resources. By comparing programs across the graduate school, the administration and faculty bodies can make informed
Overview of the process

The graduate program prioritization process is based on Dickson’s (2010) Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services. This text was developed to be used with undergraduate programs and so a diverse committee sought to adapt this work to better meet the needs of SCSU’s School of Graduate Studies. Guided by the University mission and the mission of the Graduate School, the committee tailored Dickson’s work to fit our program prioritization process.

Ultimately the goal of the process is to strengthen the graduate school overall by reallocating existing resources to improve the quality of SCSU graduate education overall and thereby strengthen our reputation.

This process started with establishing criteria, ranking those criteria, and determining how the criteria would be measured. From this point, individual programs will create reports based on the criteria and the committee will evaluate the reports placing programs into mutually exclusive categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Added Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>Candidates for enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>Retained at a higher level of support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>Retained at a neutral level of support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>Retained at a lower level of support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>Candidates for reduction, phasing out, or consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>New or Substantially Reorganized Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How is this different from a review?

Like the academic standards review, this process is focused on programs rather than departments as a whole. Unlike program review, this process is tied to resource allocation. The goal of program prioritization is to categorize all the programs across the graduate school at one time, with specific recommendations as to how resources should be greater, maintained, reduced, or another strategy that may optimize a program.

Another striking difference between the prioritization process and the academic standards review is that reviews are conducted on a staggered schedule and assume continuance.

Who is on this committee?

The committee is comprised of faculty, administration, and critical support staff. Specifically, the committee is co-chaired by Gregory Paveza, Graduate Dean, and Christine Petto, Graduate Council Chair, included representatives from the four schools, and the university at large. Alphabetically:

School of Arts & Sciences:
- Alain D'Amour · Steven Breese · Susan Cusato · Theresa Marchant-Shapiro

School of Business:
- Benjamin Abugri · Samuel Audoh · Ellen Dunn · Robert Forbus

School of Education:
- Robert Axtell · Jess Gregory · Hak Joon Kim · Deborah Newton

School of Health and Human Services:
- Suzanne Carroll · Esther Howe · James MacGregor · Deborah Weiss

University at-Large:
- Michael Ben-Avie · Lise Brule · William Faralas · Tim Krauss · Steve Larocco · Richard Riccardi
Timeline

The process began with the selection of the committee membership and an initial meeting in November of 2012. Committee members read Dickson’s (2010) Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services. Committee members were divided into three subcommittees to expedite the process of determining criteria and how they would be measured.

As the subcommittees and larger committee met, the initial, ambitious timeline was expanded. Over the course of the spring of 2013 five categories were developed, the ten criteria were ranked, and questions for the ten criteria were drafted.

During the late spring it was determined that the lists of questions for each of the criteria were expansive and further narrowing of focus would be required. An initial weighting system was also developed.

In the summer of 2013, Dickson created and marketed a rubric to accompany his book. At the same time a private company was marketing a digital way of compiling program prioritization data.

Early in the fall 2013 semester, the whole committee evaluated how useful the digital the program would be for our needs and asked the developers some challenging questions. Based on the responses, the committee decided not to use the marketed program, but rather focus on the criteria and rubric we were developing in-house.

During the fall semester the criteria were further narrowed and the first program (history) piloted writing the report. This informed the committee to refine the data required and highlighted where the criteria questions and draft rubric were not yet aligned.

Two more programs (math and communication disorders) piloted writing the reports during the winter intersession and the committee met to finalize the criteria questions in January of 2014.

The rubric and weightings were finalized in February 2014. Programs will write their reports, and the committee will read them in the Spring 2014 semester.

Important Dates:

12 February 2014 – By 5pm all FAAR data to be included should be entered into DigitalMeasures (https://www.digitallm.com/login/sonthern/faculty/)

13 February 2014 – All data (save productivity data) will be posted by mid-day for programs.

18 February 2014 – Productivity data posted.

1 April 2014 – Program Prioritization Reports Due.

April 2014 – The committee will read the reports, meet, deliberate and make recommendations.

Early May 2014 – The committee’s recommendations will be presented and given to the President.

Do I have to write a report?

According to Dickson, a program is any activity or collection of activities that consumes resources (dollars, people, time, space, equipment). We have operationalized the list of programs based on the graduate catalog and the data that is recorded in the Banner Data Management System. While this is not as fine grained as Dickson suggests, it is a better fit for our graduate program prioritization process. Note, concentrations, teacher certifications, and cross endorsements are included with the major degree or sixth-year certificate, unless otherwise described.

The 47 programs that will write reports are:

- Master of Science in Art Education
- Master of Science in Biology
- Master of Science in Chemistry
- Master of Arts in Romance Languages
- Master of Science in TESOL
- Master of Arts in Science in History
- Master of Science in Mathematical Education
- Master of Science in Applied Physics
- Master of Arts in Psychology
- Master of Science in Sociology
- Master of Arts in Women’s Studies
  • Advanced Certificate in Women’s Studies
  • Graduate Certificate in Women’s Studies
- Master of Business Administration
- Master of Science in Computer Science
- Master of Library Science - General, School Media, or Teacher Cert
• 6th Year Professional Diploma – Specialization in Information Studies
• Master of Science in Counseling – Clinical Mental Health or Community Counseling
• Master of Science in Counseling – School Counseling
• Master of Science in School Psychology
• 6th Year Professional Diploma – Clinical Mental Health or School Counseling
• 6th Year Professional Diploma – School Psychology
• Master of Science in Education
• 6th Year Professional Diploma – Classroom Teacher Specialist
• Master of Science in Special Education
• 6th Year Professional Diploma – Educational Coach
• 6th Year Professional Diploma – Concentration in an Area of Special Education
• Master of Science in Reading - General, Remedial, Consultant, Teacher Cert. or Cross Endorsement
• 6th Year Professional Diploma – Reading
• Master of Marriage and Family Therapy (MFT)
• Clinical Nurse Leader Certificate Program
• Nurse Educator Certificate Program
• Family Nurse Practitioner Certificate Program
• Doctorate in Education – Nursing Education (Ed.D.)
• Master of Science in Nursing
• Master of Science in Recreation and Leisure Studies - General, Park & Rec Mgmt. or Therapeutic Rec
• Master of Social Work (MSW)
• Master of Arts or Science in English
• Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing
• Master of Political Science – General, International, or Policy & Admin
• 6th Year Professional Diploma – Educational Leadership
• Doctorate in Educational Leadership (Ed.D.)
• Master of Science in Exercise Science - Human Performance, Sports Psych. or Teacher Ed
• Master of Science in School Health Education
• Master of Science in Communication Disorders
• Master of Public Health (MPH)
• Master of Science in Environmental Education
• Master of Science in Science Education - General or Teacher Cert
• 6th Year Professional Diploma – Science Education

The criteria and rankings

The ten criteria were ranked by each individual of the full committee and the subcommittee compiled the results. The highest ranked criteria was External demand for the program followed by Quality of program outcomes. Impact, justification, and overall essentiality of the program. Quality of program inputs and processes; Size, scope and productivity of the program. Internal demand for the program. Revenue and other resources generated by the program. Opportunity analysis of the program. Costs and other expenses associated with the program, and finally History, development and expectations of the program.

Writing the report

While the criteria are ranked and these ranks are used in the evaluation of the reports, the order of the criteria for the report match the organization in the Dickeson book. If there is a reason that an element of a criterion is not applicable, explain why that is in the section. The committee will consider the explanations, and recognizes that even with best efforts, this is not a one-size fits all format. The same is true of the data provided. All the data for the report is being provided. If there is a reason you think the data are inaccurate, explain that in the narrative section. Do not try to collect additional data.

The word limits for each section are hard limits. Any words beyond the stated word limit will be cut from the submitted report, so take care to adhere to the word limits for each section.
Accessing program data

Data are available through MySCSU. Open the graduate office tab and then a list of departments will be available.

The program level data are grouped by department in the excel file, but are clearly labeled within the excel spreadsheet. For most of the criteria, the data are disaggregated by program and labeled. To enter the data into a report the program data may just be copied and pasted into the report directly. Note that for some criteria the data were not able to be disaggregated. This is a special challenge for the committee reading the reports. Please copy and paste the data provided in the narrative space indicate somewhere that the data are aggregate data for N programs. Please do not adjust the data from the spreadsheet. If there are discrepancies, please use the narrative portion of the response to identify them and the possible implications.

1. History, development and expectations of the program

The first criterion is History, development and expectations of the program. This criterion has two parts:

a. Provide, to the best of your ability, a brief description of the program’s history including the evolution of the program over the years. Describe specific changes that have been made to the program curriculum, changes to student demographics and the impact of these changes on the program, and efforts to recruit students to the program. If this is a new program, describe efforts to build the program and the progress of these efforts to date. (550 words)

b. Is there anything else you would like us to know? (Issues you might choose to discuss could include visibility of the program, relationships the program has external to the university, changes in the economic support for the program, staffing, etc.) (150 words)

Some things to consider when writing this section is how have students’ needs changed? How does the program respond to changes in student needs? How have external factors been driving changes in the program?

2. External Demand for the Program

a. Using the data provided, review and explain the relationship between the program and external factors that impact the:

   i. number of applicants and percentage of applicants accepted

   ii. 5-year enrollment trends (450 words)

b. Which employers, institutions and/or communities benefit from this program? Describe how the program meets the needs of the state (e.g., economic, cultural, civic, etc.)? (150 words)

c. Is there anything else you would like us to know? (Issues you might choose to discuss could include competition from local, regional, and other institutions.) (100 words)

This section contains two tables, to create these tables, please directly copy and paste from the spreadsheet downloaded from the “Program Prioritization Spreadsheets” for your department. Note that there is a spreadsheet for each department and within that spreadsheet there are data for each individual program for each required table. When writing this section, focus on how sustainable the demand is for the program, and what sort of need(s)
does the program fulfill. Is there a special niche that the program is positioned to fill that promises continuing demand?

3. Internal Demand for the Program

a. Using the data provided, please describe how courses in your program serve students in other programs. What percentage of students in your courses come from other programs? Please provide enrollment data for graduate courses offered by your department that are required for other graduate programs. (Some of your discussion in this section may be repetitive, but is important in understanding the internal demand for the program.) (100 words)

b. How is enrollment for your graduate program influenced by enrollment in your undergraduate program? Is there potential for a formal pathway between the two programs? (100 words)

c. How reliant are you on non-program students taking your courses? (100 words)

d. Does the program produce services needed by other parts of the campus (e.g., clinics, testing services)? (100 words)

e. Is there anything else you would like us to know? (200 words)

Different programs are going to have very different responses in the prompts. Some programs that are wholly independent will have very little to say in 3a and 3c. Programs that only serve graduate students will have little for 3b.

If the program is developing a pathway like a 4+1, include that in this section. Programs may also wish to include any courses that students tend to take as electives that enrich their experience, even if they are not required. Please provide any examples of how the program serves other parts of the campus and the positive contributions that service makes.

4. Quality of Program Inputs and Processes

a. Please provide a narrative of how the qualifications and assignments of your full- and part-time faculty align with and support the program. Please include a discussion of the challenges and successes the department faces in providing qualified faculty to meet the needs of the program. In those programs where it is appropriate, please discuss the integration of adjuncts into the program’s curriculum. (450 words)

b. Briefly describe the merits and logic of your curriculum. (250 words)

c. How dynamic is your program? Please identify and describe what procedures are in place to provide continued, regular evaluation and review (include formal and informal activities). Describe the impact of the review on the program and curriculum (e.g., FAA Er data may be used as evidence, as well as other documentation of changes to the curriculum). (300 words)

d. Is there anything else you would like us to know? (Issues you might discuss could include the quality of your incoming students, or a comparison of your curriculum, courses, assessments, experiences to similar programs. How does your program better serve students than similar programs offered elsewhere?) (200 words)

This response asks the indelicate question about the quality of faculty teaching in the program. There are a multitude of ways to answer this. The key is to provide evidence of the quality of both full-time and adjunct faculty. If the program uses adjunct faculty to meet the teaching demands, include a commentary on how adjuncts are integrated into the program. Maybe the program has a great way to ensure the quality of the taught curriculum, or uses data to inform curricular change (4c). This is the section to highlight this.

This section also provides an opportunity for programs to feature the quality of their curriculum compared to other similar programs, or the type of accolades that a program may have earned from accrediting bodies. These would be framed in section 4b and 4d.

5. Quality of Program Outcomes

a. How does your program use assessment data to ensure quality of student outcomes? Describe the quality of your
program outcomes. (e.g., G.P.A., Student Opinion Surveys, course evaluations, alumni surveys, professional assessment/evaluation, other assessments, participation in groups or organizations that focus on pedagogy or audiology). Insert a table listing your program outcomes. Note that the table does not count in the word limit. (900 words)

b. Is there anything else you would like us to know? (Issues you may choose to discuss could include preparing your students for employment or further scholarly pursuits. Where possible provide data driven examples, e.g., number of students who pass the licensing exam). (300 words)

One key thing to remember in this section is that the program outcomes, listed in a table, are not counted as a part of the word count. That said, please don’t add additional tables. How does the program use the information (see some ideas in the parentheses in 5a) to monitor/ensure high quality program outcomes? How well (how consistently) do students achieve the desired outcomes, and how does the program know?

While the first part of number 5 is quite lengthy, the second part of this criterion encourages a further expansion of what students in the program have done after they finish the program. What sort of things have students done after completion that reflect on the quality of the program? Examples of this may be the relative number that have passed high stakes exams, gone on to further academic programs, earned promotions, or perhaps had creative or scholarly work published or presented.

6. Size, scope and productivity of the program

a. How many credit hours does the program generate? (table generated by OMIR)

b. What degrees or certificates are awarded? (This is a simple list of degrees and will list only one degree or certificate unless you are one of the programs approved to report your data in combination)(in table form with item c)

c. How many degrees or certificates have been awarded (five year data)?

d. Using the data provided, present and discuss the record of the graduate faculty in research/creative activity. (200 words)

e. What types of student or student/faculty research or creative activity have been developed and or produced (e.g., include theses, dissertations, special projects)? (100 words)

f. In your narrative discuss how all these data impact or have impacted the size, scope or productivity of your program. (200 words)

g. Is there anything else you would like us to know (this might include a discussion of equipment purchased solely for the purposes of the graduate program). (100 words)

Criterion six has many sub sections, but several are covered in a table that will be generated for the program. One feature of this section is the data generated by the FAAR. If you are uncomfortable with the FAAR data for any reason, please don’t change the provided data, rather use some of the narrative to explain any possible discrepancies. Were there faculty that have left or retired that may not have entered data into DigitalMeasures (6d)? Use the narrative to comment on trends in the size, scope and productivity. Were all faculty members included in the number of publications (6d)? Are there other forms of creative activity or productivity that may not be represented in the FAAR data that are relevant (6d)? Try to comment on to what degree faculty are engaged in creative activity that is presented to a public forum (not limited to scholarly work).

The word limits will limit the number of dissertation, theses, and special project titles that can be included. Rather than providing a comprehensive list, describe any trends and provide example titles (6e). This section is looking for how students are engaged in creative activities that are presented to audiences beyond the program.

If your program has responded to lower enrollments in a creative way, through course rotation, special offerings, summer/winter session courses.
off campus or online activities/courses, include the impact the responses have had. How has supervising/collaborating with students on projects impacted the program? Consider any ways that the scope of your program may be impacting the program as a whole (61).

The final section is again that catch all place. If there is anything that is relevant to further the readers’ understanding of how the program is growing or can’t grow because it is constrained in some way, make it clear here.

7. Revenue and other resources generated by the program

a. What are the sources and how much revenue does the program generate through student enrollments?

b. What are the sources and how much additional revenue does the program generate through fees such as laboratory or special user fees? (50 words)

c. What are the sources and how much revenue does the program generate by services (e.g., external or to other programs)? (50 words)

d. In the narrative on this section discuss how the revenues and other resources impact the size, scope and productivity of your program? (100 words)

e. Is there anything else you need us to know? (You may wish to discuss grant activity, gifts to the University, etc.) (100 words)

The revenue data are prorated on the number of billing credit hours. Like section 5, this section has elements that don’t require additional narrative. The parts that provide an opportunity for narrative are brief and center on to what degree the program generates revenue for the university. There may be sections here where programs simply list “none,” particularly when a department offers services to the community for free, like mentoring. If there were proposed sources of revenue that were not approved, a program may wish to include that information in this section.

The largest item in this section, 5d, is an opportunity to explain how resource constraints have impacted the program. If the program has had an influx of resources, how has that impacted the program?

The last section may include grants that are internal, within SCSU or ConSCU, or external. Perhaps students in the program have earned grants or scholarships that have impacted the program, if so this is a good place to address what, if any, influence they have had.

8. Costs and other expenses

a. What are the total costs of the program? (table)
b. What is the ratio of costs to services? (table)
c. What investment in new resources does the program require? (200 words)
d. What demonstrable efficiencies exist in the way the program is operated (e.g., summer courses, cross-listed courses, etc.)? (100 words)

The data for the tables for 8a and 8b are provided for each program. The second two parts of this element are the opportunities for the program to highlight what additional resources the program requires, and possibly what impact that these resources may have. Finally, how does the program seek to make the most of the resources it does have?

While the rubric is focused on the ratio of costs to revenue (8b), the committee has discretion to adjust the holistic rating for the section based on the narratives the program provides.

9. Impact, justification, and overall essentiality of the program

a. How does this program connect to the University’s mission statement and/or the Graduate School’s mission statement? (100 words)
b. How does this program respond to societal needs that the institution values? (e.g., producing a critical thinking, educated citizenry, improving the state’s workforce, meeting health care needs of the community, etc.)? (100 words)
c. To what extent does this program help the institution differentiate itself from similar programs at peer institutions? (100 words)
d. Is there anything else you would like us to know? (100 words)
While building the narrative for this section, the program will provide evidence that it connects to the university (http://www.southernct.edu/about/scsu-info/mission.html) or Graduate School (https://www.southernct.edu/academics/graduate/) mission.

Another feature of this element is the uniqueness of each program. How does the program differentiate itself from other similar or local programs? Is there something special about the program or a feature of the program that addresses a societal or other need? Highlight program attributes that help SCSU and the Graduate School fulfill their respective missions.

**10. Opportunity analysis of the program**

a. Describe the external opportunities for strengthening your program. (300 words)

b. Describe the internal opportunities for strengthening your program. (300 words)

How has your program identified opportunities for the growth of the program? What sort of opportunities exist? Describe how the program may already be positioned to take advantage of opportunities. Some opportunities may seem too big, but if they aren’t included how can a program aim for them? Nothing is off the table.

Is there evidence that some of these opportunities are more ripe than others? Highlight any low hanging fruit even if it is small. By carefully identifying all the possible opportunities the program positions itself to capitalize on them.

**How will these be evaluated?**

After the full committee read the Dickson book, the subcommittee charged with ranking the criteria polled the group and compiled the rankings. These data were also used to determine the relative weights of the criteria.

If you are not interested in how the actual weightings were calculated, feel free to skip this paragraph. In the interest of transparency the process was as follows. The individual rankings were flipped because the committee members ranked the criteria from 1 to 10 with 1 being the most important. To assign the highest weight to the most important category, these had to be flipped. The average rank and standard deviation for each of the criteria were calculated and these were used to determine a factor score. This factor was determined by dividing the criterion average score by the sum of the average scores. These factor scores add up to 1.00 and were converted to percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. External demand for the program</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quality of program outcomes</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Impact, justification, and overall essentiality of the program</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quality of program inputs and processes</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Size, scope and productivity of the program</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Internal demand for the program</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Revenue and other resources generated by the program</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Opportunity analysis of the program</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Costs and other expenses associated with the program</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. History, development and expectations of the program</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These weights will be applied to the scores generated by the rubric (appendix a). You will notice that there are spaces for comments by the report readers. The rubric was designed to permit note taking so that when the committee meets as a group they have a record of their thoughts as they read individual reports. While each criterion will eventually be distilled to a single number, the process is still subjective. Individual readers will apply the rubric and then the group will deliberate each program’s report.

It is important to note that the report is the only evidence that will be used in the scoring of the rubric and in the deliberations, so it is important to include information that you may think “everyone knows that.” Please include it!

**What if I need more help?**

This document was designed to provide the basic guidance needed to complete the report. The committee deliberated on the wording of the prompts within the criteria and the rubric to achieve clarity. That being said, sometimes it is just better to see an example.

The programs that have piloted the process have reports posted that you can access through MySCSU. Once you log into MySCSU, click on the “Graduate Office” tab.
Once you have entered that link, you will see the links to a template that includes the Criteria and Questions, the presentations from the town hall meetings and links to the sample reports.

If you are writing your report and have a question regarding the data or you would like to request additional data, those requests will go through Dean Pavez.

pavez.ca@southernct.edu. Other questions on the process should also be directed to Dean Pavez. Once you have written your report, if there are specific sections on which you would like feedback or if you are unsure of whether you have addressed a prompt, you can set up a time to discuss it with Christine Petto, pettoc1@southernct.edu.

Throughout the graduate program prioritization process the committee has aimed for transparency. Now that programs are writing their reports that goal has not changed. There are 50 reports being written around campus, together we can support each other and achieve our goal of an even stronger graduate school.

Jess L. Gregory compiled this advice document.
Graduate Program Prioritization Criteria and Questions/Elements

1. History, Development and Expectations of the Program
   a. Provide, to the best of your ability, a brief description of the program's history including the evolution of the program over the years. Describe specific changes that have been made to the program curriculum, changes to student demographics and the impact of these changes on the program, and efforts to recruit students to the program. If this is a new program, describe efforts to build the program and the progress of these efforts to date. (550 words)

   b. Is there anything else you would like us to know? (Issues you might choose to discuss could include visibility of the program, relationships the program has external to the university, changes in the economic support for the program, staffing, etc.) (150 words)

2. External Demand for the Program
   a. Using the data provided, review and explain the relationship between the program and external factors that impact the:
      i. number of applicants and percentage of applicants accepted
      ii. 5-year enrollment trends (450 words)

   b. Which employers, institutions and/or communities benefit from this program? Describe how the program meets the needs of the state (e.g., economic, cultural, civic, etc.)? (150 words)

   c. Is there anything else you would like us to know? (Issues you might choose to discuss could include competition from local, regional, and other institutions.) (100 words)

3. Internal Demand for the Program
   a. Using the data provided, please describe how courses in your program serve students in other programs. What percentage of students in your courses come from other programs? Please provide enrollment data for graduate courses offered by your department that are required for other graduate programs. (Some of your discussion in this section may be repetitive, but is important in understanding the internal demand for the program.) (100 words)
b. How is enrollment for your graduate program influenced by enrollment in your undergraduate program? Is there potential for a formal pathway between the two programs? (100 words)

c. How reliant are you on non-program students taking your courses? (100 words)

d. Does the program produce services needed by other parts of the campus (e.g. clinics, testing services)? (100 words)

e. Is there anything else you would like us to know? (100 words)

4. Quality of Program Inputs and Processes

a. Please provide a narrative of how the qualifications and assignments of your full- and part-time faculty align with and support the program. Please include a discussion of the challenges and successes the department faces in providing qualified faculty to meet the needs of the program. In those programs where it is appropriate, please discuss the integration of adjuncts into the program’s curriculum. (450 words)

b. Briefly describe the merits and logic of your curriculum. (250 words)

c. How dynamic is your program? Please identify and describe what procedures are in place to provide continued, regular evaluation and review (include formal and informal activities). Describe the impact of the review on the program and curriculum (e.g., FAAR data may be used as evidence, as well as other documentation of changes to the curriculum). (300 words)

d. Is there anything else you would like us to know? (Issues you might discuss could include the quality of your incoming students, or a comparison of your curriculum, courses, assessments, experiences to similar programs. How does your program better serve students than similar programs offered elsewhere?) (200 words)

5. Quality of Program Outcomes

a. How does your program use assessment data to ensure quality of student outcomes? Describe the quality of your program outcomes. (e.g., G.P.A., Student Opinion Surveys, course evaluations, alumni surveys, professional assessment/evaluation, other assessments, participation in groups or organizations that focus on pedagogy or andragogy. Insert a table listing your program outcomes. Note that the table does not count in the word limit). (900 words)
b. Is there anything else you would like us to know? (Issues you may choose to discuss could include preparing your students for employment or further scholarly pursuits. Where possible provide data driven examples, e.g., number of students who pass the licensing exam). (300 words)

6) **Size, scope and productivity of the program**

a. How many credit hours does the program generate? (table generated by OMIR)

b. What degrees or certificates are awarded? (This is a simple list of degrees and will list only one degree or certificate unless you are one of the programs approved to report your data in combination)(in table form with item c)

c. How many degrees or certificates have been awarded (five year data)?

d. Using the data provided, present and discuss the record of the graduate faculty in research/creative activity. (200 words)

e. What types of student or student/faculty research or creative activity have been developed and or produced (e.g., include theses, dissertations, special projects)? (100 words)

f. In your narrative discuss how all these data impact or have impacted the size, scope or productivity of your program. (200 words)

g. Is there anything else you would like us to know (this might include a discussion of equipment purchased solely for the purposes of the graduate program). (100 words)

7) **Revenue and other resources generated by the program**

a. What are the sources and how much revenue does the program generate through student enrollments?

b. What are the sources and how much additional revenue does the program generate through fees such as laboratory or special user fees? (50 words)

c. What are the sources and how much revenue does the program generate by services (e.g., external or to other programs)? (50 words)
d. In the narrative on this section discuss how the revenues and other resources impact the size, scope and productivity of your program? (100 words)

e. Is there anything else you need us to know? (You may wish to discuss grant activity, gifts to the University, etc.) (100 words)

8) **Costs and other expenses**

a. What are the total costs of the program? (table)

b. What is the ratio of costs to revenues? (table)

c. What investment in new resources does the program require? (200 words)

d. What demonstrable efficiencies exist in the way the program is operated (e.g., summer courses; cross-listed courses, etc.)? (100 words)

9) **Impact, justification, and overall essentiality of the program**

a. How does this program connect to the University’s mission statement and/or the Graduate School’s mission statement? (100 words)

b. How does this program respond to societal needs that the institution values? (e.g., producing a critical thinking, educated citizenry; improving the state’s workforce; meeting health care needs of the community, etc.)? (100 words)

c. To what extent does this program help the institution differentiate itself from similar programs at peer institutions? (100 words)

d. Is there anything else you would like us to know? (100 words)

10) **Opportunity analysis of the program**

a. Describe the external opportunities for strengthening your program. (300 words)

b. Describe the internal opportunities for strengthening your program. (300 words)
Criteria Rankings & Weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>History, development and expectations of the program</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Costs and other expenses associated with the program</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Opportunity analysis of the program</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Revenue and other resources generated by the program</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Size, scope and productivity of the program</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Internal demand for the program</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Quality of program inputs and processes</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Impact, justification, and overall essentiality of the program</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Quality of program outcomes</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>External demand for the program</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New or substantially reorganized Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce/Fund Resources to other programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidate or phase out a program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Level of Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain QSE in terms of Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Level of Program Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Program at current levels of enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Program Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand/Enhance Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptors**

**Category**

**Program Prioritization Categories**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria not applicable due to:</th>
<th>Exceptional (9)</th>
<th>7.5</th>
<th>Satisfactory (6)</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>Needs Improvement (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. History, Development, and Expectations of the Program</td>
<td>The program provides compelling and well-documented evidence that it is responding to the changing needs of students and demographics.</td>
<td>The program provides evidence that it is responding to the changing needs of students and demographics, but it is not compelling.</td>
<td>The program provides limited evidence that it is responding to the changing needs of students and demographics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic Evaluation Criterium 1</td>
<td>Exceptional (9)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Satisfactory (6)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Needs Improvement (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. External Demand for the Program</td>
<td>The program provides evidence that there is a growing, sustainable student demand.</td>
<td>The program provides evidence that there is a growing student demand or evidence that this demand is sustainable, but not both.</td>
<td>The program provides limited evidence that there is a growing or stable student demand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic Evaluation Criterium 2</td>
<td>Exceptional (9)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Satisfactory (6)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Needs Improvement (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Internal Demand for the Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>The program provides evidence of exceptional service to other university programs (graduate or undergraduate) or campus entities; such programs could not flourish without the service provided by this program.</th>
<th>The program provides evidence of moderate service to other university programs (graduate or undergraduate) or campus entities.</th>
<th>The program provides limited or no evidence regarding service to other programs (graduate or undergraduate) or campus entities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holistic Evaluation Criterium 3</td>
<td>Exceptional (9)</td>
<td>Satisfactory (6)</td>
<td>Needs Improvement (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight 9.1%</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Quality of Program Inputs and Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>The program provides evidence that all faculty are qualified and current in their field.</th>
<th>The program provides evidence that most of the faculty are qualified and current in their field.</th>
<th>The program provides limited evidence that some of the faculty are qualified and current in their field.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holistic Evaluation Criterium 4</td>
<td>Exceptional (9)</td>
<td>Satisfactory (6)</td>
<td>Needs Improvement (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight 10.8%</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The program provides evidence that adjunct faculty are purposefully integrated into the program.

The program provides evidence that adjunct faculty are integrated into the program.

The program provides limited or no evidence that adjunct faculty are integrated into the program.

The program provides ample evidence of a meritorious curriculum.

The program provides evidence of a meritorious curriculum.

The program provides limited or no evidence of a meritorious curriculum.

The program provides evidence that there are systematic, continuing improvements to the curriculum (i.e., the curriculum is dynamic).

The program provides evidence that improvements to the curriculum are either (a) intermittent or (b) limited in scope.

The program provides evidence that improvements to the curriculum are made infrequently and are limited in scope.
### 5. Quality of Program Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Exceptional (9)</th>
<th>Satisfactory (6)</th>
<th>Needs Improvement (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/9</td>
<td>The program provides ample evidence that it uses assessment data in order to ensure quality of student outcomes.</td>
<td>The program provides evidence that students exceed stated outcomes.</td>
<td>There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that students meet stated outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic Evaluation Criterium 5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Size, Scope, and Productivity of the Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Exceptional (9)</th>
<th>Satisfactory (6)</th>
<th>Needs Improvement (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/9</td>
<td>The program is growing as evidenced by Credit Hours and degrees/certificates awarded or has reached capacity as evidenced by the narrative.</td>
<td>The program is maintaining its size as evidenced by Credit Hours and degrees/certificates awarded.</td>
<td>The program is shrinking as evidenced by Credit Hours and degrees/certificates awarded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic Evaluation Criterium 6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight 8.4%</td>
<td>7. Revenue and Other Resources Generated by the Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>The program generates exceptional revenue per billing credit hour (greater than or equal to 105% of the graduate school median revenue per billing credit hour, BCH).</td>
<td>The program generates satisfactory revenue per billing credit hour on its own (between 95% and 105% of the graduate school median revenue per BCH).</td>
<td>The program generates revenue that needs improvement on its own. (Revenue per billing credit hour is less than or equal to 95% of the graduate school median revenue per BCH.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/9</td>
<td>Holistic Evaluation Criterion 7</td>
<td>Exceptional (9)</td>
<td>Satisfactory (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight 6.9%</td>
<td>8. Costs and Other Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>The ratio of costs to revenue is less than 80% of the graduate school average.</td>
<td>The ratio of costs to revenue is between 80% and 120% of the graduate school average.</td>
<td>The ratio of costs to revenue is greater than 120% of the graduate school average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/9</td>
<td>Holistic Evaluation Criterion 8</td>
<td>Exceptional (9)</td>
<td>Satisfactory (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight 13.8%</td>
<td>9. Impact, Justification, and Overall Essentiaity of the Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>The evidence indicates that there is a strong relationship between the program and the missions of the University and/or Graduate School.</td>
<td>The evidence indicates that there is a moderate relationship between the program and the missions of the University and/or Graduate School.</td>
<td>The evidence indicates that there is a weak relationship between the program and the missions of the University and/or Graduate School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/9</td>
<td>The evidence provided by the program makes a compelling case that it is responding to a societal need.</td>
<td>The evidence provided by the program makes a moderate case that it is responding to a societal need.</td>
<td>The evidence provided by the program makes a marginal case that it is responding to a societal need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The program clearly differentiates itself from its competitors in a positive way.</td>
<td>The program somewhat differentiates itself from its competitors.</td>
<td>The program provides limited evidence that it differentiates itself from its competitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic Evaluation</td>
<td>Exceptional (9)</td>
<td>Satisfactory (6)</td>
<td>Needs Improvement (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Opportunity Analysis of the Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>/9</td>
<td>Evidence demonstrates that there are major internal opportunities to strengthen the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence demonstrates that there are moderate internal opportunities to strengthen the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence demonstrates that there are marginal internal opportunities to strengthen the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holistic Evaluation</td>
<td>Exceptional (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criterium 10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfactory (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Needs Improvement (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. History, Development, and Expectations of the Program

    | Exceptional | Satisfactory | Needs Improvement | Score |
    |--------------|--------------|------------------|-------|
    | 4.5          | 3.5          |                  |       |

Please enter your final holistic score for this section (max. score = 8). To enter your holistic score, click on the Add Row button below and enter a number in the box. Then click on the Calculate button to view your Weighted Score for this section.

2. External Demand for the Program

    | Exceptional | Satisfactory | Needs Improvement | Score |
    |--------------|--------------|------------------|-------|
    | 4.5          | 3.5          |                  |       |

Please enter your final holistic score for this section (max. score = 8). To enter your holistic score, click on the Add Row button below and enter a number in the box. Then click on the Calculate button to view your Weighted Score for this section.
Appendix C
Graduate Programs Prioritization

Why Prioritization Now

➢ Graduate Enrollments Are Down

➢ Resources are Reduced

➢ Proliferation of Programs without a Plan
Why Prioritization Now

➤ State Resources are continuing to decline

➤ Cost of Graduate Education Continues to Increase

➤ Need to match resources to a variety of needs

Other Key Reasons

➤ Quality of Our Programs

➤ Innovation of Our Programs

➤ Access to Our Programs
What Constitutes a Program

Any activity or collection of activities that consumes resources (dollars, people, time, space, equipment).

If you believe in reincarnation, come back as an academic program and enjoy eternal life.

The Case for Prioritization

➢ Academic Programs are the heart of the institution and drive costs for the entire campus
  • We are the premier institution in the system in terms of quantity and quality of our graduate programs
➢ Graduate Programs have been permitted to grow or shrink without regard to their relative worth.
The Case for Prioritization

➢ The Graduate School and our graduate programs may be striving to be all things to all people rather than focusing.

➢ Growing incongruence between our graduate programs and resources to mount them with quality.

The Case for Prioritization

➢ Traditional approaches to control resource reduction (across the board cuts) tend to foster mediocrity for all programs

➢ The most likely source of needed resources is reallocation of existing resources from weakest to strongest programs.
The Inescapable Truth is

**NOT ALL PROGRAMS ARE EQUAL**

- Some are more efficient
- Some are more effective
- Some are more central to our mission

---

Program Prioritization Permits

- Analysis focused on pre-selected criteria
- Concentration on resource development & resource utilization, independent of structure
- Focus on efficiency, effectiveness and centrality to mission
- Identify opportunities to increase revenue, decrease expenses, improve quality, strengthen reputation
Three types of decisions

Michael Porter of the Harvard Business School suggests there are three types of decisions:

- Tough decisions: **WHAT TO DO**
- Tougher decisions: **WHAT NOT TO DO**
- Toughest decisions: **WHAT TO STOP DOING**

Setting Graduate Academic Priorities

- Will focus on
  - PROGRAMS, not departments
  - PRIORITIZATION, not “Review”
    (Reviews assume continuance, are not generally tied to resource allocation, and are not conducted simultaneously)
The Prioritization Criteria


The Prioritization Criteria

1. History, Development & Expectations of the Program
2. External Demand
3. Internal Demand
4. Quality of Inputs & Processes
5. Quality of Outcomes
The Prioritization Criteria

6. Size, Scope & Productivity
7. Revenue and Other Resources Generated
8. Costs and Other Expenses
9. Impact, Justification and Overall Essentiality
10. Opportunity Analysis

A Sample Prioritization Structure

» Enrichment or expansion of an existing program
» Addition of a new program
» Reduction of a program
» Consolidation or restructuring of a program
» Elimination of a program
Our Process Timeline

- Selection of the Program Prioritization Committee (completed)
- First meeting (early to mid December)
- Intensive meeting schedule to set outline for program reports and metrics for the criteria and develop our unique prioritization categories (January through mid-February)
  Frequent reports and a town hall or two to share the results of these discussions.
- Programs develop and submit reports (mid-February to mid-May) Reports will be provided to committee members as they are submitted

Our Process Timeline

- Review of reports and assignment to prioritization categories (mid-May to mid-June) Frequent reports and at least one town hall to allow for feedback on prioritization assignment including meeting with the external community
- Mid-June to End of June: Dean writes final report for submission to President and Cabinet for Implementation. Again, the draft report will be distributed to the largest audience possible for feedback.
The Committee

➤ Co-Chairs
  • Gregory Paveza, Interim Dean of Graduate Studies
  • Christine Petto, Chair, Graduate Council

➤ Members
  • School of Arts and Sciences
    • DonnaJean Fredeen
    • Christine Broadbridge
    • Alain D’Amour
    • Theresa Marchant-Shapiro

The Committee

➤ School of Business
  • Ellen Dumin
  • Benjamin Abugri
  • Samuel K. Andoh
  • Robert Forbus

➤ School of Education
  • Deborah Newton
  • Robert Axtell
  • Jess Gregory
  • Chang Suk Kim
The Committee

➤ School of Health and Human Services
  • Gregory J. Paveza
  • Suzanne Carroll
  • Jim MacGregor
  • Deborah Weiss

➤ University At-Large
  • Lise Brule
  • Rick Riccardi
  • Michael Ben-Avie
  • Steve Larocco
  • Susan Cusato

➤ Administrative Support, Claudia Guy

Continuation of the Process

➤ Data will be kept

➤ Data will be updated annually

➤ Determination of a schedule for reprioritization
Conclusion

➤ We may no longer be able to afford to be what we've become in terms of Graduate Programs
➤ Reallocation of Resources is Necessary
➤ Reallocation Requires Systematic, Academically Responsible Prioritization
➤ With Courage – and Leadership from all areas of the University Community – Our Graduate Programs can be strengthened.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS
Graduate Programs
Prioritization

Progress of the Committee

➢ Committee Formed

➢ First Meeting Held in December 2012

➢ Three Subcommittees formed
The Committee

➤ Co-Chairs
  • Gregory Paveza, Interim Dean of Graduate Studies
  • Christine Petto, Chair, Graduate Council

➤ Members
  • School of Arts and Sciences
    • DonnaJean Fredeen
    • Christine Broadbridge
    • Alain D’Amour
    • Theresa Marchant-Shapiro

➤ School of Business
  • Ellen Dumin
  • Benjamin Abugri
  • Samuel K. Andoh
  • Robert Forbus

➤ School of Education
  • Deborah Newton
  • Robert Axtell
  • Jess Gregory
  • Chang Suk Kim
The Committee

- School of Health and Human Services
  - Gregory J. Paveza
  - Suzanne Carroll
  - Jim MacGregor
  - Deborah Weiss
- University At-Large
  - Lise Brule
  - Rick Riccardi
  - Michael Ben-Avie
  - Steve Larocco
  - Susan Cusato
- Administrative Support, Claudia Guy

The Prioritization Criteria

1. History, Development & Expectations of the Program
2. External Demand
3. Internal Demand
4. Quality of Inputs & Processes
5. Quality of Outcomes
The Prioritization Criteria

6. Size, Scope & Productivity
7. Revenue and Other Resources Generated
8. Costs and Other Expenses
9. Impact, Justification and Overall Essentiality
10. Opportunity Analysis

Subcommittee on Criteria 1 - 5

- The purpose of this Subcommittee was to determine the data and narrative elements to be included in these Criteria
- Members
  - DonnaJean Fredeen – Co-Chair
  - Susan Cusato – Co-Chair
  - Tess Marchant-Shapiro
  - Benjamin Abugri
  - Robert Axtell
  - Jim MacGregor
  - Lise Brule
Subcommittee on Criteria 6 - 10

➢ The purpose of this Subcommittee was to determine the data and narrative elements to be included in these Criteria.
➢ Members
  • Ellen Durnin – Co-Chair
  • Steve Larocco – Co-Chair
  • Alain D’Amour
  • Samuel Andoh
  • Chang Suk Kim
  • Suzy Carroll
  • Rick Ricardi

Subcommittee on Prioritization Categories

➢ The purpose of this committee was four fold:
  • Develop the prioritization categories
  • Determine how criteria should be ranked
  • Develop a Rubric for Scoring Prioritization Reports
  • Develop weights for each of the criteria
Subcommittee on Prioritization Categories

➢ Members
  • Deborah Newton – Co-Chair
  • Deborah Weiss – Co-Chair
  • Christine Broadbridge
  • Robert Forbus
  • Jess Gregory
  • Esther Howe
  • Michael Ben-Avie

Meeting Schedule

➢ The full committee met on a bi-weekly basis through the Spring Semester
  • First meeting of the committee was on 18 DEC 2012
  • Several meetings were cancelled due to weather related closings of the University
  • Subcommittees met in most cases on alternate weeks to complete their tasks
Criterion 1 – History, Development and Expectations of the Program

➢ Provide, to the best of your ability, a brief description of the program’s history including the evolution of the program over the years. Describe specific changes that have been made to the program curriculum, changes to student demographics and the impact of these changes on the program, and efforts to recruit students in the program. If this is a new program describe efforts to build the program and progress of these efforts to date. Limit this description to 200 words.
➢ What is the visibility of the program? What relationships does the program have that are external to the university?
➢ Have recent changes in the economic support of the institution, such as staffing, course enrollment minima, equipment status, operating expense support, and market support, impacted the operation of the program? Please be specific about how these changes have affected individual components of your program (e.g. on recruitment, course cancellations, or quality of program).

Criterion 2 – External Demand for the Program

➢ Please provide a comprehensive review of the relationship between the program and external factors such as:
  - number of applicants and percentage of applicants accepted
  - 5-year enrollment trends
➢ How does competition from local and regional institutions (including other CSU institutions) affect demand for the program? If another CSU institution offers a similar program, please describe how the Southern program compares to it in design, scope and enrollment.
➢ Which employers, institutions and/or communities benefit from this program? Does the program meet an employment need for the state?
➢ Are there any other factors which influence external demand for the program?
Criterion 3 – Internal Demand for Program

- Please describe how courses in your program serve students in other programs. What percentage of students in your courses come from other programs? Please provide enrollment data for graduate courses offered by your department that are required for other graduate programs.
- How is enrollment for your graduate program influenced by enrollment in your undergraduate program? Is there potential for a formal pathway between the two programs?
- How reliant are you on other students taking your courses?
- Does the program produce services needed by other parts of the campus (e.g. clinics, testing services)?
- Are there any other factors which influence internal demand for the program?

Criterion 4 – Quality of Program Inputs and Processes

- Please provide a narrative of how the qualifications and assignments of your full and part-time faculty align with and support the program. Please include a discussion of the challenges and successes the department faces in providing qualified faculty to meet the needs of the program.
- Compare your program’s curriculum (e.g. courses, assessments, experiences) with similar programs from other institutions. Discuss why your program and curriculum may better serve students (i.e. how you address delivery modes, learning styles, recent curricular revisions, quality of faculty and equipment).
- Please identify and describe what procedures are in place to provide continued, regular evaluation and review (include formal and informal activities).
- Is there any other crucial information that is necessary in assessing the quality of your inputs?
Criterion 5 – Quality of Program Outcomes

- What assessments does your program have in place to ensure quality of student outcomes? Describe the quality of your program outcomes (G.P.A., Student Opinion Surveys, alumni surveys, course evaluations, professional assessment/evaluation, and other assessments)?
- Identify your learning outcomes and methods used to assess student outcomes.
- What is the track record of the graduate program faculty in producing research/creative activity?
- What is the effectiveness of the program in preparing students for the future (e.g. for employment or further scholarly pursuits)?
- Is there additional information that is necessary in assessing the quality of program outcomes?

Criterion 6 – Size, Scope and Productivity of the Program

- How many students are being served?
- How many faculty (credit hours) are assigned?
- How many staff and what proportion of their time is assigned?
- What other resources are used (supplies, equipment, etc.)?
Criterion 6 – Size, Scope and Productivity of the Program

➢ What are the numbers of credit hours generated?
➢ What degrees or certificates awarded?
➢ What types of student or student/faculty research or creative activity have been developed and or produced?
➢ How many degrees or certificates have been awarded (five year data)?

Criterion 7 – Revenue and Other Resources Generated by the Program

➢ What are the sources and how much revenue does the program generate through student enrollments?

➢ What are the sources and how much additional revenue does the program generate through fees such as laboratory or special user fees?

➢ What are the sources and how much revenue does the program generate by services it provides to other programs?
Criterion 7 – Revenue and Other Resources Generated by the Program

➤ What are the sources and how much revenue does the program generate through grant activity?

➤ What are the sources and how much revenue does the program generate through development or advancement dollars (or other gifts)? Do such gifts require the continuance of the program?

➤ What are the sources and how much revenue has the program attracted for equipment or other capital investments?

Criterion 8 - Costs and Other Expenses of the Program

➤ What are the total costs of the program?

➤ What demonstrable efficiencies exist in the way the program is operated?

➤ What investment in new resources does the program require?

➤ What is the ratio of costs to revenues?
Criterion 9 – Impact, Justification, and Overall Essentiality of the Program

- What impact or benefit has this program had or does it promise to have?
- How does this program connect to the institution’s mission and strategic plan?
- Does this program respond to a unique societal need that the institution values?
- To what extent does this program help the institution differentiate itself from the crowd of other colleges and universities?

Criterion 10 – Opportunity Analysis of the Program

- What external environmental factors create opportunities that affect the program?
- Are there opportunities for the program to continue, but in a different format (with a revised curriculum, for example)?
- Are there opportunities in the program for productivity gains?
- Are there cost-containment measures due to restructuring or technological innovation that would aid the program, such as increasing rigorous web resources?
Criterion 10 – Opportunity Analysis of the Program

➢ Can the program strengthen itself by collaborating with other programs or institutions?
➢ What can faculty and the university do to promote the program?
➢ What opportunities are there to enhance the program through distance learning?
➢ Is there any other crucial information that is necessary in assessing the future promise of this program?

Ranking of Criteria

➢ A consensus process in which all members of the Committee were asked to rank the criteria was used.
➢ Individual rankings were averaged.
➢ The averaged rankings were discussed by the committee and final rankings were determined.
➢ The next slide presents the rankings as determined by the committee.
Ranking of Criteria

1. Criterion 2: External Demand for Program
2. Criterion 5: Quality of Program Outcomes
3. Criterion 9: Impact, Justification and Overall Essentiality of the Program
4. Criterion 4: Quality of Program Inputs and Processes
5. Criterion 6: Size, Scope and Productivity of the Program

Ranking of Criteria

6. Criterion 3: Internal Demand for Program
7. Criterion 7: Revenue and Other Resources Generated by the Program
8. Criterion 10: Opportunity Analysis of the Program
9. Criterion 8: Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program
10. Criterion 1: History, Development and Expectations of the Program
Program Prioritization Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates for Enrichment</td>
<td>Expand/Enhance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase Program Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain at a Higher Level of Support</td>
<td>Maintain program at current levels of enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase level of program support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain at Neutral Level of Support</td>
<td>Maintain Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain at a Lower Level of Support with possible restructuring</td>
<td>Maintain Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce level of support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates for phase out or consolidation with another program</td>
<td>Consolidate or phase out a program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redistribute resources to other programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New or Sustained/Reorganized Program</td>
<td>New or reorganized program for which there is currently insufficient data for the committee to make a recommendation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programs to Be Evaluated

- In reviewing the catalog, I initially identified 84 programs
- After discussion a number of programs were removed, reducing current list to 68 programs, this includes, MA's, MS's, Doctoral Programs, 6th Year Diplomas
- Deans, Chairs and Program Coordinators will review list and make recommendations for further reductions by end of May 2013
Time Line

- Write, Receive Comment on, and Complete Manual for Preparing Reports – Summer 2013
- Final List of Programs to be Prioritized Decided – End of Summer 2013
- Distribute Manual to All Departments – Early September 2013
- Complete Scoring Rubric for Program Prioritization Reports – Mid-September 2013
- Discuss and approve weights for each criterion – Mid-September

Time Line

- Programs Write Reports – Mid-September to Mid-November 2013
- Reports Submitted – End of November 2013
- Committee Reviews Reports and Prioritizes Programs – End of November 2013 to Mid-February 2014
- Draft Report Written and Reviewed by Committee – Mid-February to Mid-March 2014
- Draft Report Presented to University Community – Early April 2014
Time Line

➢ Programs submit rebuttals to recommendations concerning program should they wish – By end of April 2014
➢ Final Report with Rebuttals prepared and presented to President and University Community – Mid – May 2014

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS
GRADUATE PROGRAM PRIORITIZATION

TOWN HALL MEETING
31 JANUARY 2014
2-4PM
EN C112

GRADUATE PROGRAM PRIORITIZATION SCHEDULE

3 February 2014 – Criteria Template posted on My SCSU (Graduate Office Tab)
(12 February 2014, 5pm – update FAAR through DM)
13 February 2014 – Data; Rubric; Pilot Programs posted
13 February 2014 – Technical Manual posted
18 February 2014 – FAAR Productivity Data posted
(Note: relay any additional data requests through Dean Pavez, pavezagi@southernct.edu)
1 April 2014 – Prioritization Reports due by 5pm
April 2014 – GPPC Deliberations & Recommendations
Early May 2014 – Recommendations to President
History, Development, Expectations

CRITERION #1a

Provide, to the best of your ability, (i.) a brief description of the program’s history including the evolution of the program over the years. (ii.) Describe specific changes that have been made to the program curriculum, (iii.) changes to student demographics and the impact of these changes on the program, and (iv.) efforts to recruit students to the program. (If this is a new program, describe efforts to build the program and the progress of these efforts to date.) (550 words)

CRITERION #1b

Is there anything else you would like us to know? (Issues you might choose to discuss could include visibility of the program, relationships the program has external to the university, changes in the economic support for the program, staffing, etc.) (150 words)

Example response re: ‘economics’: “The cancellation of our search for an Africanist in Fall 2012 has meant that our programs fail to cover most of an entire continent.”

Example response re: external relationships: “Because of the necessity of external practica placements for our students, we have developed relationships with most of the hospitals in the state, a large number of skilled nursing facilities, . . .”
External Demand
CRITERION #2a

*Using the data provided*, review and explain the relationship between the program and external factors that impact the: (i.) number of applicants and percentages of applicants accepted; (ii.) 5-year enrollment trends *(450 words)*

Example response: reporting of a higher number of applications (compared to the program records) is due to the varying definition of “complete” file... For those applicants who meet the SGS minimum grade point average (3.0) and have a strong subject grade point average (3.0 or greater), admissions is supported by the program.

---

CRITERION #2a (table)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Acceptance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>MS-CMD</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>MS-CMD</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>MS-CMD</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>MS-CMD</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>MS-CMD</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITERION #2b

Which employers, institutions and/or communities benefit from this program? Describe how the program meets the needs of the state (e.g., economic, cultural, civic, etc.)? (150 words)

Example Response: Our MS program benefits the middle schools and high schools of CT, both public and private.

Example Response: Upon graduation, 100% of our students become employed as speech-language pathologists (SLPs) in a wide variety of settings.

CRITERION #2c

Is there anything else you would like to know? (Issues you might choose to discuss could include competition from local, regional, and other institutions.) (100 words)

Example response: Sacred Heart will be recruiting students for its first class of CMD masters students and is also currently recruiting faculty... we will need to be vigilant...

Example response: there are ‘post bac’ programs similar to our certification only program
**Internal Demand**

**CRITERION #3a**

*Using the data provided,* please describe how courses in your program serve students in other programs. What percentage of students in your courses come from other programs? Please provide enrollment data for graduate courses offered by your department that are required for other graduate programs. (Some of your discussion in this section may be repetitive, but is important in understanding the internal demand for the program.) *(100 words)*

Example response: “courses not required”

Example response: “may take courses as electives in their home programs”; “approximately 25% non-program students enroll in graduate history courses.” (see table 6a)

---

**CRITERION #3b**

How is enrollment for your graduate program influenced by enrollment in your undergraduate program? Is there potential for a formal pathway between the two programs? *(100 words)*

Example response: “We are working on a 4 + 1 program that will hopefully be up and running within a couple of years.”

Example response: “Some of our students come into the program with bachelor degrees in another field, so they must complete 11 pre-requisite UG courses.”
CRITERION #3c

How reliant are you on non-program students taking your courses? (100 words)

Example responses: “One of our electives, PSY 527 – Abnormal Child Psychology, is required for students in the Counseling and School Psychology program.”

Example response: “We are not reliant at all on non-program students taking our courses.”

CRITERION #3d

Does the program produce services needed by other parts of the campus (e.g., clinics, testing services)? (100 words)

Example response: “The program runs a thriving clinic that sees approximately 150 clients on a weekly basis. SCSU employees and employee family members are seen at no cost.”

Example response: No
CRITERION #3e

Is there anything else you would like us to know? (100 words)

Example response: “In summary, the strength of our program currently relies on external demand…”

Example response: “Post-bac programs churn out certified teachers in non-shortage areas. . . . the SOE is already overburdened with certification students, and the market is not in need of certification students that would compete with our own BS and MS students. . . most of the strong students that initially seek ‘certification only’ end up entering our MS program because the State requires that teachers earn a master’s degree and many choose to stay within their teaching discipline.”

Quality of Program Inputs & Processes

CRITERION #4a

Please provide a narrative of how the qualifications and assignments of your full-time and part-time faculty align with and support the program. Please include a discussion of the challenges and successes the department faces in providing qualified faculty to meet the needs of the program. In those programs where it is appropriate, please discuss the integration of adjuncts into the program’s curriculum. (450 words)

Example response: 21 tenured or tenure-track faculty, 18 of whom are members of Graduate Faculty. . . Over the past five years all graduate faculty members have taught graduate courses for the program. . . Example response: . . . All of whom have their doctoral degrees. . . . All of whom participate in the graduate program as thesis advisors, exam committee members or special project advisors. . .

Example response: “Each faculty member and clinical instructor has an academic/clinical/research specialty area. . . Ensuring that students meet the competency standards set by ASHA. . . It is a challenge to recruit faculty. . . Publicized shortage. . . Master’s level are highly sought after. . . Receive desirable starting salaries. . . . Highly Reliant on adjuncts for our Clinic. . . Supervised by Clinic Director.”
CRITERION #4b

Briefly describe the merits and logic of your curriculum. (250 words)

Example response: Our courses map very well with the academic and professional needs of today’s in-service teachers. The goals of the core curriculum are to teach the mathematics content courses taught in most HS at a theoretical level. For example, ... Example response: Curricula is logically sequenced to cover the science of communication, normal speech and language development ... Students take courses prior to or concurrently with supervised on-campus practica and accumulate more than the 400 hours of clinical required by ASHA.

CRITERION #4c

How dynamic is your program? Please identify and describe what procedures are in place to provide continued, regular evaluation and review (include formal and informal activities). Describe the impact of the review on the program and curriculum (e.g., FAAR data may be used as evidence, as well as other documentation of changes to the curriculum). (300 words)

Example response: ASHA certification ... Reports must be submitted for recertification every 8 years ... New standards effective January 2014 ... Development of course in reading ... Positive feedback from ASHA. On-going discussions with professional community.

Example response: In November 2012, the department received a Curriculum Related Grant to invite 20 former students ... Their input prompted the program to add the curricular special project as a capstone option. It is common practice in teaching history at the university level that faculty introduce new readings and new assignments to keep the courses up-dated and the students well-versed in the types of writing (and research) that historians accomplish. These are, after all, graduate students seeking a mastery-level education in history. The faculty members keep the program dynamic not only by staying active in their respective fields (see 6d) ...
CRITERION #4d

Is there anything else you would like us to know? (Issues you might discuss could include the quality of your incoming students, or a comparison of your curriculum, courses, assessments, experiences to similar programs. How does your program better serve students than similar programs offered elsewhere?) (200 words)

Example response: courses taught by full-time faculty, richer and more varied clinical experience

Example response: MS in Mathematics Education rather than a MAT degree. No degrees in mathematics offered at nearby competitors such as ECSU, UB, UNH, Sacred Heart, and QU

Quality of Program Outcomes
CRITERION #5a

How does your program use assessment data to ensure quality of student outcomes? Describe the quality of your program outcomes. (e.g., GPA, Student Opinion Surveys, course evaluations, alumni surveys, professional assessment/evaluation, other assignments, participation in groups or organizations that focus on pedagogy or andragogy. Insert a table listing your program outcomes. Note that the table does not count in the word limit). (900 words) [Note: use only tables provided & discuss any remaining information in narrative.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Fall '12</th>
<th>Spring '12</th>
<th>Fall '13</th>
<th>Spring '13</th>
<th>Fall '14</th>
<th>Spring '14</th>
<th>Fall '15</th>
<th>Spring '15</th>
<th>Fall '16</th>
<th>Spring '16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITERION #5a cont’d

In narrative, comment on survey, etc. You have room for a 900-word narrative!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Information Survey</th>
<th>SVA</th>
<th>SVA</th>
<th>SVA</th>
<th>SVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of instruction have helped me understand the subject matter</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading the assigned material has helped me understand the subject matter</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams and class assignments have helped me understand the subject matter</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning from group &amp; peer graded assignments has been sufficient to evaluate my progress</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My experiences in this class made me want to learn more about this subject</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rate the quality of instruction in this course as high</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rate the overall quality of this course as high</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course helped me reach the learning goals</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course evaluated how well I met those learning goals</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My experiences in this course helped me appreciate this subject</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor provided regular feedback on my performance in the course</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor had high standards for student achievement</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor encouraged me to take responsibility for my own learning</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CRITERION #5a cont’d

Example response: Student Opinion Survey results are consistently above 80% for agree and strongly agree and 90% of the questions yielded 90% agree and strongly agree.

Example response: Yes, we have made decisions based on student outcome data. For example, graduate students have struggled with an understanding of historiography, so courses and all capstone activities must now include some portion addressing historiography.

Example response: We have adjusted course content to reflect new technologies our students use in their professional lives. We reflect on our pedagogy to ensure the connection between the advanced graduate courses and the nature of the secondary school curriculum.
CRITERION #5a cont’d

- Conduct historical research
- Demonstrate an understanding of historiography and its relevance to the study of history
- Develop historical arguments and debates
- Effectively present orally and in written format historical information, arguments, and debates in the form of presentations, book reviews, bibliographic essays, research papers, prospectuses, and theses
- Present original historical arguments using both primary and secondary sources
- Demonstrate critical thinking skills as utilized in the above 5 items
- Effectively utilize Chicago style

CRITERION #5b

Is there anything else you would like us to know? (Issues you may choose to discuss could include preparing your students for employment or further scholarly pursuits. Where possible provide data driven examples, e.g., number of students who pass the licensing exam). (300 words)

Example response: In addition to a 100% pass rate for Praxis II and GPA of 3.8, employment rate is 100% over the past five years. There is high demand for our graduate students. The inclusion of practica ensure that our students are well-prepared for the work force.

Example response: Some of our graduate students have successfully moved on to doctoral programs, other master's degree programs, and even to fellowships at foreign institutions.
## Size, Scope & Productivity

### CRITERION #6a (table)

How many credit hours does the program generate?  
(table generated by OMIR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits Generated</th>
<th>AY 08/09</th>
<th>AY 09/10</th>
<th>AY 10/11</th>
<th>AY 11/12</th>
<th>AY 12/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Academic Cr.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Credits</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AY 08/09</th>
<th>AY 09/10</th>
<th>AY 10/11</th>
<th>AY 11/12</th>
<th>AY 12/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Acad. Cr.</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Cr.</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CRITERION #6b & #6c (table)

(b) What degrees or certificates are awarded? (This is a simple list of degrees and will list only one degree or certificate unless you are one of the programs approved to report your data in combination.) (In table form with item c).

(c) How many degrees or certificates have been awarded (five-year data)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Confired</th>
<th>AY 08/09</th>
<th>AY 09/10</th>
<th>AY 10/11</th>
<th>AY 11/12</th>
<th>AY 12/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS-Communication Disorders</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AY 08/09</th>
<th>AY 09/10</th>
<th>AY 10/11</th>
<th>AY 11/12</th>
<th>AY 12/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees Confired</th>
<th>AY 08/09</th>
<th>AY 09/10</th>
<th>AY 10/11</th>
<th>AY 11/12</th>
<th>AY 12/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS-Mathematical Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITERION #6d (table)

Using the data provided, present and discuss the record of graduate faculty in research/creative activity. (200 words)

Please encourage your colleagues to update (or backfill) their FAAR (through Digital Measures) from Fall 2009 to May 2013. A table will be provided and the program representative will have a 200-word narrative to discuss and highlight the productivity of program faculty.

Example response: Over the past five years, faculty members in the program have produced an average of 9-10 publications in well-respected, refereed journals. In addition, an average of 23 local and national professional presentations were made, and 4-5 grants were awarded to faculty each year. Example response: Faculty members keep abreast of developments in their discipline through conference attendance and presentations at the regional, national, and in some cases international levels, and by publishing research, survey papers or article reviews. Some faculty have written free (open-source) textbooks. Over the past five years, eight members of the department have received sabbatical leaves.

CRITERION #6e

What types of student or student/faculty research or creative activity have been developed and/or produced (e.g., include theses, dissertations, special projects)? (100 words)

Example response: Students who select a writing capstone option must present their work in a seminar or at a regional professional meeting. (include sample titles)
Example response: Over the past five years thirty-two master’s theses were produced. For example, . . .
Example response: Some students choose the thesis option and typically present their research at the national convention. Other students develop or produce presentations or publications through GRFs or research conducted as a GSGAs.
CRITERION #6f

In your narrative discuss how all these data impact or have impacted the size, scope or productivity of your program. (200 words)

Example response: Over the past five years the graduate course rotation has been modified to minimize class cancellations. The program endeavors to create a rotation so that students are able to complete their coursework in two years.

Example response: While program faculty are quite productive, directing theses and special products are quite time consuming and never fit into the limited time accorded by a 3-credit course.

Example response: The diversity of our faculty areas of expertise, their involvement in the clinic, and published research has made our program highly sought after by potential graduate students.

CRITERION #6g

Is there anything else you would like us to know (this might include a discussion of equipment purchased solely for the purposes of the graduate program). (100 words)

Example response: The drop in enrollments has required that the program reduce the number of graduate offerings from five courses in 2008 to three courses in 2013. Even with the drop in enrollments we have been able to run 85% of our graduate courses with an average class size of 16 over the course of five years.

Example response: Several i-pads and a variety of treatment and augmentative communication applications have been purchased, which provides students with additional technological training. We recently purchased a flexible endoscope for evaluation of voice and swallowing disorders. This equipment is state-of-the-art, and many practicing clinicians are seeking training in using this equipment.
### CRITERION #7a (table)

What are the sources and how much revenue does the program generate through student enrollments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Tuition &amp; Fees</th>
<th>Other Revenue</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>223,300</td>
<td>57,548</td>
<td>280,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>242,695</td>
<td>54,961</td>
<td>297,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>243,383</td>
<td>97,739</td>
<td>341,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Tuition &amp; Fees</th>
<th>Other Revenue</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,064,903</td>
<td>974,554</td>
<td>2,039,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,151,073</td>
<td>1,013,818</td>
<td>2,164,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,321,749</td>
<td>1,145,850</td>
<td>2,467,599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CRITERION #7b

What are the sources and how much additional revenue does the program generate through fees such as laboratory or special user fees? (50 words)

Example response: None
CRITERION #7c

What are the sources and how much revenue does the program generate by services (e.g., external or to other programs)? (50 words)

Example response: See table below that details the revenue generated by the program's clinic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMD Clinic</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>97,857</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMD Clinic</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>137,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMD Clinic</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>128,087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CRITERION #7d

In the narrative on this section discuss how the revenues and other resources impact the size, scope and productivity of your program. (100 words)

Example response: With the revenue for the program generated only by student enrollment, the program must adapt its size as described above by reducing the number of graduate courses offered per semester. The scope of the program remains the same with all three fields covered.

Example response: Space (or lack of) is a resource that significantly impacts the size and scope of our program. Our limited office and laboratory space has hindered us in the recruiting of faculty... We have faced losing an excellent job candidate due to lack of space for research. We currently have searches for three faculty members but office space for only one.
CRITERION #7e

Is there anything else you need to use to know? (You may wish to discuss grant activity, gifts to the University, etc.) (100 words)

Example response: Our department receives gifts in the form of scholarship funds for meritorious undergraduates. There are no such funds for graduate students. While many faculty members receive internal grants such as the CSU grant, there are no external grants for the graduate program.

Example response: A US State Department Grant ($99,900) for study abroad to Vietnam (Ho Chi Minh City) was orchestrated by Marianne Kennedy, Michele Thompson, and Ilene Crawford. While in place several students, including graduate students from the program were able to study in Vietnam.

Costs & Expenses

CRITERION #8a & 8b

(a) What are the total costs of the program? (table provided)

(b) What is the ratio of costs to revenues? (table provided)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Employee Compensation</th>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>Allocated Indirect Costs</th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
<th>Ratio Cost/Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>(131,683)</td>
<td>(1,068)</td>
<td>(176,492)</td>
<td>(369,243)</td>
<td>.49/1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>(127,812)</td>
<td>(1,358)</td>
<td>(168,557)</td>
<td>(297,727)</td>
<td>.48/1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>(125,524)</td>
<td>(1,214)</td>
<td>(131,113)</td>
<td>(257,851)</td>
<td>.54/1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Employee Compensation</th>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>Allocated Indirect Costs</th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
<th>Ratio Cost/Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>(1,652,163)</td>
<td>(41,371)</td>
<td>(943,381)</td>
<td>(2,636,915)</td>
<td>1.29/1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>(1,713,084)</td>
<td>(74,469)</td>
<td>(992,868)</td>
<td>(2,780,421)</td>
<td>1.28/1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>(1,870,164)</td>
<td>(67,144)</td>
<td>(1,018,727)</td>
<td>(2,956,035)</td>
<td>1.2/1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITERION #8c

What investment in new resources does the program require? (200 words)

Example response: Program requires additional space and faculty lines. 
Example response: Institutional assistance in advertising and promoting the program, especially for our new program in applied statistics.
Example response: (1) Internship arrangements with area middle and secondary schools and (2) grants (or program funding such as GAships) for MA students hoping to move on to PhD programs.

CRITERION #8d

What demonstrable efficiencies exist in the way the program is operated (e.g., summer courses, cross-listed courses, etc.)? (100 words)

Example response: A proprietary software program generates a class schedule for a two- or three-year period for each student as well as class lists. The program is able to project class enrollments for two years in advance. All courses are offered twice a year and no courses have ever been cancelled.
Example response: All courses are on a two-year rotation and three of the core courses are offered during the summer to allow part-time students to complete coursework within two years.
**Impact, Justification, & overall essentiality**

**CRITERION #9a**

How does the program connect to the University's mission statement and/or the Graduate School's mission statement? (100 words)

Example response: The program’s mission is to provide **exemplary graduate education** in professional disciplines. Our students are hailed as excellent clinicians who provide evaluation, treatment, and **advocacy services** for children and adults with communication disorders in the **culturally and economically diverse communities** of CT and beyond.

Example response: As teachers and mentors, program students take **leadership positions** in CT classrooms in order to **prepare the next generation** for challenges that lay ahead.

**CRITERION #9b**

How does this program respond to societal needs that the institution values? (e.g., producing a critical thinking, educated citizenry; improving the state’s workforce; health care needs of the community, etc.)? (100 words)

Example response: There is a need for accomplished and **socially- and intellectually-engaged** secondary school teachers who lay the foundation of knowledge for the students we encounter at the undergraduate level. Southern CT State University was founded on the principles of **educating teachers**. While its mission has grown, it would be a **monumental blunder** for this institution to allow this historical mission to fall by the wayside.

Example response: The program **participates in and supports** the **STE(A)M disciplines** aimed at producing a skilled workforce.

Example response: Program student **organization** is heavily service oriented participating in **fund raising** for autism, Alzheimer's disease, traumatic brain injury, and Parkinson's disease.
CRITERION #9c

To what extent does this program help the institution differentiate itself from similar programs at peer institutions? (100 words)

Example response: We accept twice the number of students that both UConn and Sacred Heart and provide more clinical opportunities for our students, both on and off campus.

Example response: Our peer institutions in the region either offer a Master’s degree in mathematics or an M.A.T. degree, which is comprised more of pedagogy. Our degree provides a blend of solid mathematical content and pedagogical strategies for the classroom.

CRITERION #9d

Is there anything else you would like us to know? (100 words)

Example response: It is difficult to provide an adequate measure of the essentiality of our graduate program to the institution’s mission, but it certainly provides an excellent service to the CT academic community and society in general that is very much in the spirit of that mission. Moreover, the program operates at a reasonable profit.
Opportunity analysis
CRITERION #10a

Describe the external opportunities for strengthening your program. (300 words)

Example response: The program already has internship connections (and some informal relationships) with several of the local historical societies across the state, the Peabody Museum, the Pequot Museum, and even, more recently, the New York Botanical Gardens. It is the goal of the program to further develop these relationships for all of our program students.

Example response: Seek external grants (e.g., from Dept. of Education) for a collaborative effort between SED and CMD to work with autistic children.

Example response: There are initiatives and partnership programs at the state and federal levels geared toward promoting and supporting the STE(A)M disciplines.

CRITERION #10b

Describe the internal opportunities for strengthening your program. (300 words)

Example response: Create a doctorate of Audiology (Au.D.): there is only one such program in the state. Develop a collaborative program with other departments within the HHS School such as Nursing, Social Work, etc. There are already efforts underway to approve joint transdisciplinary health and human services courses.

Example response: Create a Mathematics Emporium in which students have in-house opportunities for hands-on experience, a field experience that allows students to experiment (in a monitored environment) with strategies learned in their coursework.

Example response: Engage in a cooperative conversation between graduate certification programs, the SOE, alumni, and those secondary school teachers that serve as adjuncts, coaches, and supervisors.
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Context & Purpose

- Calculate more accurate overhead expenses and indirect costs
- Provide more complete understanding of what it costs to run a program or perform a function
- Provide data to answer financial questions in Program Prioritization Process
- Enable targeted changes so that maximum resources are available for value-added activities that meet strategic objectives and goals
- Help SCSU serve constituencies and fulfill the mission and vision statements with the best possible use of resources

Updated October 24, 2013
Activity-Based Costing Concepts

- ABC provides a more accurate illustration of the cost to operate a program (or perform a function) than traditional financial or budgetary reporting
  - direct costs are included based on actual expenditures
  - indirect costs are considered in a way that is related to a particular function; i.e. overhead costs are allocated to each program/function using appropriate cost drivers, such as...
    - facilities operations costs allocated based on the square footage occupied
    - school and academic overhead allocated based on credit hours of the relevant student population

Activity-Based Costing Concepts

- Step-Down (our current model)
  - Costs allocated from areas serving the largest areas / populations down through more focused service providers
  - Once costs allocated for an area, “downstream” costs are not allocated back up to that area
  - Redistributing data to report by academic program adds a variation to the method by reallocating between areas within a level (School Revenue and Costs)
ABC Step-Down (our current model)

0. Not Allocated
1. Facilities Operations
2. Exec Office & Gen'l Admin
3. Finance and Administration
4. Other Op Funds — Contractual
5. Agency Funds
6. Univ. Affairs & Institutional Advancement
  6.5 Fin & Admin: Student Services
7. Auxiliary & Non-academic
8. Academic Overhead
9. School Overhead

"Y" = receipt of step-down allocation from levels above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Level Description</th>
<th>Facilities Alloc</th>
<th>Exec Off Alloc</th>
<th>Fin and Admin Alloc</th>
<th>UAAM Alloc</th>
<th>Fin and Admin: Student Services</th>
<th>Aux and Non-Acad Alloc</th>
<th>Acad OH Alloc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Allocated</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Facilities Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Executive Offices &amp; Gen’T Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Finance and Administration</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other Operating Funds - Contractual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University Affairs and Institutional Advancement</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Fin and Admin: Student Services</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Auxiliary and Non-academic</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Academic Overhead</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>School Overhead</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- "Y" (yes) or "N" (no) is a general rule, however, some levels with "Y" have line items for which no space is allocated.
- There is also an "uncertain" category built into the model as a placeholder to denote items about which decisions need to be made.
- Facilities costs are allocated based on square footage.
- Levels 3, 4, and 5 are allocated using direct costs based on the ratio of the line item receiving the allocation to the total Gl. cost in the remaining lower levels.
- Academic and school overhead costs are allocated based on Billing Credit Hours.

Updated August 20, 2013
Data

- Fiscal Year
  - For AY data, Summer Pterm SSA, SAB, AS1, and ESS go with current FY. (SSB, SSC, and SBC are next FY)
- Financial: Operating Revenue and Expenses
- Facilities: Square Footage and Occupancy
- Scheduling:
  - Academic spaces > Classes and Events
  - Athletic spaces > Academics, Athletics, Club Sports, and Intramurals
- Registration: Billing Credit Hours in categories to support allocation statistics
- Faculty Workload: Service to home & other depts; instructional vs. non-instructional work

Revenue Allocation

- Each account assigned Allocation Statistic
- Measurement closest to type of revenue stream
  - direct revenue (e.g. Lab Fee for specific undergraduate program)
  - Billing Credit Hours
    - full-time grad load credits
    - full-time load credits
    - full-time undergrad load credits
    - on-line load credits
    - part-time doctorate load credits
    - part-time grad load credits
    - part-time undergrad load credits
  - not allocated
  - not allocated - grants and contracts
  - not allocated - Insurance
  - not allocated - student aid
  - not allocated - system
  - not allocated - technology
Revenue Allocation

- Revenue Allocation Calculation
  - Revenue account multiplied by Ratio of Dept/Pgm Credit Hours to Total Credit Hours of Allocation Statistic
  - History Dept example
    - Rev Acct “Tuition FT In-State Undergrad” = $28,524,367.60
    - Allocation = full-time undergrad credits = 11,153.6
    - Total full-time undergrad credits = 195,976.6
    - 11,153.6/195,976.6 = 0.0569129
    - $28,524,367.60 * 0.0569129 = $1,623,403 Tuition FT In-State Undergrad allocated to History Dept

---

Calculations

How Billing Credit Hours are Counted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Flag</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>Include</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Cancelled Course</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Cancelled Course</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>Drop/Delete</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>Drop for Non-Payment</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>Web Drop</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Never Attended</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Placement Exam Registration</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>Drop/Delete Post Add/Drop</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td><strong>Registered</strong></td>
<td>Include</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RW</td>
<td><strong>Web Registered</strong></td>
<td>Include</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RZ</td>
<td>Registered Post Add/Drop</td>
<td>Include</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Course Withdrawal</td>
<td>Lookup</td>
<td>If withdrawal after frozen file date, then include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF</td>
<td>Withdraw from Course (Fail)</td>
<td>Lookup</td>
<td>If withdrawal after frozen file date, then include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Univ. Withdrawal (w/grade)</td>
<td>Lookup</td>
<td>If withdrawal after frozen file date, then include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>Univ. Withdrawal PT (w/grade)</td>
<td>Lookup</td>
<td>If withdrawal after frozen file date, then include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WN</td>
<td>Univ. Withdrawal (no grade)</td>
<td>Lookup</td>
<td>If withdrawal after frozen file date, then include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>Withdraw from Course (Pass)</td>
<td>Lookup</td>
<td>If withdrawal after frozen file date, then include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td>Web Course Withdrawal</td>
<td>Lookup</td>
<td>If withdrawal after frozen file date, then include</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Calculations

• Use of Billing Credit Hours
  – Tuition and fees are charged based on student level; therefore, all Graduate student credit hours counted as Graduate credits

Calculations

• Use of scheduling data in calculations
  – General Classrooms & Common Spaces = ratio of hours used to 15 hours possible use per day (7:30 a.m.–10:30 p.m.)
    • Academics and events
    • For events, student clubs and organizations linked to academic areas are "charged" to Student Life
  – Athletic Facilities = ratio of hours scheduled to
    • 18 hours per day in 32 weeks of AY
    • 12 hours per day during other 20 weeks
    • Athletics, Exercise Science, Recreation & Leisure Studies, Club Sports, and Intramurals
### Expense Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step-Down Level</th>
<th>Allocation Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not Allocated</strong></td>
<td>Expenses, as reported in the GL, which have been pulled out of the costing model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These expenses relate primarily to Financial Aid, Grants, Scholarships and bond funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation of Facilities</strong></td>
<td>Facilities Operation grouping is allocated first and the allocation is based upon square footage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Facilities Operation grouping was not loaded with any costs as a time study would be required for accurate assignment of costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residence Life and Food Services were not allocated any facility costs as these costs are charged directly to those departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAUP and Agency (Student Activity) funds were not allocated any facility cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation of Executive Offices &amp; Gen'l Admin</strong></td>
<td>The Executive Offices grouping includes costs associated with the Office of the President and the four VPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This grouping is allocated based on Direct Costs (individual GL DC / Total remaining GL DC after current group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation of Finance and Administration</strong></td>
<td>The Finance and Administration grouping includes costs associated with the controller, financial planning, accounting, accounts payable, payroll, duplicating and mail services, purchasing, and telecommunications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This grouping is allocated based on Direct Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Operating Funds – Contractual</strong></td>
<td>These groupings are only allocated Executive Office and Finance and Administration Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These costs are not allocated to any other grouping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expense Calculation

- **Allocation of University Affairs and institutional Advancement**: These two offices are allocated based on Direct Costs.
- **Allocation of Fin and Admin: Student Services**: This grouping includes costs associated with the Bursar's office and Financial Aid. This grouping is allocated based on Direct Costs (individual GL DC / Total remaining GL DC after current group).
- **Auxiliary and Non-academic**: This group includes athletics, bookstore, residence life, and food services. This grouping is allocated Facilities (except for Residence and Food Services as they are charged directly for services), Executive Offices, Finance and Administration, and University Affairs and Institutional Advancement costs. Auxiliary and Non-academic costs are not allocated to any other grouping.
- **Allocation of Academic Overhead**: The Academic Overhead group includes the offices of Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, Graduate Studies, Continuing Ed, and University Affairs. This group is allocated based on Load Credit Hours (which includes non-credit courses). The Deans' offices are excluded from this allocation as there are no Load Credit Hours associated with their offices.
- **Allocation of School Overhead**: The School Overhead group represents the Deans' Offices at each of the five schools. Allocation is based on Load Credit Hours. The Dean's office in a particular school is only allocated to the departments which fall into that school.
Expense Calculation

- History Dept example of different allocations
  - Direct Expenses $2,402,973
  - Facilities Allocation 117,678
    - (4,809 sq ft + 916 sq ft share of Gen'l Classrooms = 5,725 / 691,748 total sq ft) * Total Facilities Exp $14,219,884
  - Exec Offices & Gen'l Admin 235,569
    - (Direct exp 2,402,973 / remaining direct exp to be allocated 132,739,884) * EO & GA exp to allocate 13,012,790
  
  ... 
  - Academic Overhead 1,418,000
    - (Pgm Cr Hrs 13,898 / Total Cr Hrs 276,580) * Academic OH exp to allocate 28,219,193

Financial Reporting vs. ABC
History Org/Dept Example (FY12)

- Rev/Exp Reporting
  Rev* $8,397,392
  - Exp 2,402,973
  = Net $5,994,419

  Credit Hours = 13,898
  Net Rev per Cr Hr = $431.1

*based on cr hr ratio

- Activity-Based Costing
  Rev* $8,397,392
  - Direct Exp 2,402,973
  - Allocations 2,150,136
  = Net Inc $3,844,283

  Credit Hours = 13,898
  Net Rev per Cr Hr = $276.6

*based on cr hr ratio
ABC Redistributions to Allocate by Program

- Based on Billing Cr Hrs by Program (ratio)
  - Undeclared and undergrad spread over school
- Revenues
  - Program share of Acct revenue recalculated based on new billing credit hour distribution
- Costs
  - Program share of Org expenses calculated in allocation by Org
  - Expenses in Org without program redistributed over school of subject

Activity-Based Costing
History Example by Program (FY12)

- **MA-HIS**
  - Rev* $266,809
  - Direct Exp 68,939
  - Allocations 69,570
  = Net Inc $128,300
  Credit Hours = 413.5
  Net Rev per Cr Hr = $311.0
  *based on cr hr ratio

- **MS-HIS**
  - Rev* $212,407
  - Direct Exp 57,307
  - Allocations 57,006
  = Net Inc  $98,094
  Credit Hours = 337.3
  Net Rev per Cr Hr = $291.6
  *based on cr hr ratio
ABC Results for Program Prioritization

- Revenue
  - Tuition & Fees
  - Other Operating Revenue
  - Total Revenue
- Expenses & Costs
  - Teaching Faculty
  - Non-Teaching Faculty & Staff
  - Operating Expenses
  - Overhead and Indirect Costs
  - Total Expenses
- Net Profit & Net per Billing Credit Hour

Updated October 14, 2013

ABC Results for Program Prioritization (FY12 History Example)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MA-HIS</th>
<th>MS-HIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td>$ 235,037</td>
<td>$ 154,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other Operating Revenue</td>
<td>31,773</td>
<td>58,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>266,809</td>
<td>212,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses &amp; Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teaching Faculty</td>
<td>61,478</td>
<td>51,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non-Teaching Faculty &amp; Staff</td>
<td>2,579</td>
<td>2,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Operating Expenses</td>
<td>4,882</td>
<td>3,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overhead and Indirect Costs</td>
<td>69,570</td>
<td>57,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138,509</td>
<td>114,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Revenue</td>
<td>$ 128,300</td>
<td>$ 98,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Revenue per Billing Credit Hour</td>
<td>$ 310</td>
<td>$ 291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Added October 14, 2013
Questions? Concerns? Other Feedback?

Lise Brule, University Controller
WT 124
x 25722
brulel1@southernct.edu

Tim Krauss
WT 123A
x 25715
krausst1@southernct.edu
Graduate Programs Prioritization Report of the Committee

The Committee – Final Membership

- Co-Chairs
  - Gregory Paveza, Interim Dean of Graduate Studies
  - Christine Petto, Chair, Graduate Council

- Members
  - School of Arts and Sciences
    - Steven Breese
    - Susan Cusato
    - Alain D’Amour
    - Theresa Marchant-Shapiro
The Committee

- School of Business
  - Ellen Durnin
  - Benjamin Abugri
  - Samuel K. Andoh
  - Robert Forbus

- School of Education
  - Deborah Newton
  - Robert Axtell
  - Jess Gregory
  - Hak Joon Kim

The Committee

- School of Health and Human Services
  - Esther Howe
  - Cynthia O'Sullivan
  - Jim MacGregor
  - Deborah Weiss

- University At-Large
  - Lise Brule
  - Rick Riccardi
  - Michael Ben-Avie
  - Steve Larocco
  - William Faroelas

- Administrative Support, Claudia Guy
A Brief History of the Project

- Committee Formed and held its first meeting in December 2012

- Spring 2013, three subcommittees work on developing the elements to be included under each of the 10 criteria, the ranking of the 10 criteria for Southern, the weights assigned to each of the criteria and the Prioritization Categories

A Brief History of the Project

- Fall 2013, the committee finalizes the elements to be included under each criteria, looks at options for how reports are to be submitted, and discusses the rubric for scoring reports.
- Spring 2014, reports submitted, scored, divided into initial categories, discussed by committee, and assigned to final categories.
A Brief History of the Project

- Summer 2014, initial draft prepared and submitted to committee for comment.
- Summer 2014, draft edited to reflect comments.
- Summer 2014, Public Draft prepared and posted to website with the new academic year.

Program Prioritization Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates for Enrichment</td>
<td>Expand/Enhance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain at a Higher Level of Support</td>
<td>Increase Program Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain program at current levels of enrollment</td>
<td>Increase level of program support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Program</td>
<td>Maintain Status Quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain at a Neutral Level of Support</td>
<td>Retain Status Quo in terms of Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Program</td>
<td>Maintain Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain at a Lower Level of Support with possible restructuring</td>
<td>Reduce level of support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates for phase out or consolidation with another program</td>
<td>Consolidate or phase out a program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New or Substantially Reorganized Program</td>
<td>Redistribute resources to other programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New or reorganized program for which there is currently insufficient data for the committee to make a recommendation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Prioritization Process

- In January 2014, Dr. Petto presented the reporting format to the Southern Community including the word limits to be imposed on each section to ensure relative similarity in report length.
- Committee discusses and approves scoring rubric. Rubric is moved to an electronic format in TK 20. This will allow for ease of scoring and calculation of scores.

The Prioritization Process

- Programs begin submitting reports beginning in February with an end of March final date for submission of all reports.
- As submitted, reports are checked for word limits, returned if necessary for reduction, converted to PDF format, and placed on website.
The Prioritization Process

- The rubric is made available to members of the Committee through TK20.
- Committee members begin scoring reports, with a date to have all scores entered by 28 April 2014. Financial data scores entered simultaneously for all reports.
- Using standard quintiles based on averaged scores for all programs, programs are assigned to initial prioritization category.

The Prioritization Process

- In early May, the committee meets to discuss the initial categorizations. Discussion of placement of programs in categories takes place. Various programs are reassigned to different categories based on the discussion.
- Draft of report prepared for comment in late May and early June and the draft is edited to reflect these comments and suggestions.
The Prioritization Process

- A Public Draft is prepared in late July and posted to the Graduate Studies website with the return of faculty to the University in late August.
- A Town Hall is planned to present the recommendations to the Southern Community, which is where we are today.

Quick Note

- All programs listed under categories are Master’s level programs unless noted otherwise.
Category 1

- This category reflects programs which in the general estimation of the committee are programs that have the capacity to expand given additional resources. These resources may be either capital resources, faculty or both.

Programs in Category 1

- Social Work
- Communication Disorders
- Clinical Counseling
- School Psychology
- Creative Writing
- School Counseling
- Public Health
- TESOL
Category 2

- This category reflects programs which in the general estimation of the committee are programs that are at capacity but need additional resources to maintain the quality and integrity of the program.

Programs in Category 2

- Psychology
- School Psychology (6th Year Diploma)
- Special Education
- Clinical Counseling (6th Year Diploma)
- Education
- Environmental Education
- Math Education
- Nursing
Category 3

- This category reflects programs which in the general estimation of the committee are programs that are at capacity and in which the resources currently invested where generally seen as being appropriate for the size of the program.

Programs in Category 3

- Women’s Studies (includes certificates)
- Recreation and Leisure Studies
- Romance Languages
- Business Administration
- Marriage and Family Therapy
- Political Science
- English
Programs in Category 3

- Reading
- Reading (6th Year Diploma)
- History
- Educational Leadership (EdD)
- Computer Science

Category 4

- This category reflects programs which in the general estimation of the committee were seen as being the right size in terms of students in the programs and demand, but in which the commitment of resources appears greater than the size of the program merits.
Programs in Category 4

- Exercise Science
- Science Education
- Science Education (6th Year Diploma)
- Educational Leadership (6th Year Diploma)

Category 5

This category reflects programs which in the general estimation of the committee were seen as functioning below their potential and the level of resources being invested in the program and need to consider restructuring the program, revamping the program, or be considered for sunsetting following appropriate University procedures.
Programs in Category 5

- Biology
- Chemistry
- Sociology
- Library Science
- Library Science (6th Year Diploma)
- Special Education (6th Year Diploma)

Programs in Category 5

- Educational Coach (6th Year Diploma)
- Classroom Teacher Specialist (6th Year Diploma)
- School Health Education
- Art Education
Programs Not Included

- Due to the fact that these programs were less than two years old at the time of the review, they were not included in the review though both did submit all elements of the report except the financial data.
  - MS in Applied Physics
  - EdD in Nursing Education

Next Steps – A Modest Proposal

- Obtain Feedback from Faculty, Students and others concerning the Recommendations. Incorporate as an Addendum to the Report.
  - Completed by Mid-November 2014

- Review of the Recommendations by the Provost and President.
  - Completed by End of November 2014

- Revision of and Final Acceptance of the Recommendations by the Provost and President.
  - Completed by End of November 2014
Next Steps – A Modest Proposal

➢ Implementation of the Recommendations with the appointment of a Committee charged with working with programs in all categories to address identified issues.
  - Committee appointed by end of Fall Term 2014

➢ The Implementation Committee will address the mechanisms to review expansion justifications prepared by programs in Category 1 and conduct those reviews.
  - Mechanisms completed by end of February 2015
  - Reviews completed by end of April 2015

Next Steps – A Modest Proposal

➢ The Implementation Committee will address the mechanisms to review the proposal put forward by the programs in Category 5, and make appropriate recommendations concerning the future of these programs.
  - Reviews completed by end of April 2015.
QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS
Appendix D
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Education Leadership</th>
<th>Computer Science</th>
<th>Physical Science</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Business Administration</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Foreign Language</th>
<th>Fine Arts</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Visual Arts</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Dance</th>
<th>Wellness</th>
<th>Physical Education</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td>01.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
<td>599.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
<td>532.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
<td>555.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>EdD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Education</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>40.10</td>
<td>41.11</td>
<td>40.12</td>
<td>41.13</td>
<td>40.14</td>
<td>41.15</td>
<td>40.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Physics</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>50.10</td>
<td>49.11</td>
<td>50.12</td>
<td>49.13</td>
<td>50.14</td>
<td>49.15</td>
<td>50.16</td>
<td>49.17</td>
<td>50.18</td>
<td>49.19</td>
<td>50.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>73.10</td>
<td>72.11</td>
<td>73.12</td>
<td>72.13</td>
<td>73.14</td>
<td>72.15</td>
<td>73.16</td>
<td>72.17</td>
<td>73.18</td>
<td>72.19</td>
<td>73.20</td>
<td>72.21</td>
<td>73.22</td>
<td>72.23</td>
<td>73.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Health Education</td>
<td>259.5</td>
<td>256.6</td>
<td>258.7</td>
<td>259.8</td>
<td>256.9</td>
<td>257.10</td>
<td>258.11</td>
<td>259.12</td>
<td>256.13</td>
<td>257.14</td>
<td>258.15</td>
<td>259.16</td>
<td>256.17</td>
<td>257.18</td>
<td>258.19</td>
<td>259.20</td>
<td>256.21</td>
<td>257.22</td>
<td>258.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teacher Education</td>
<td>401.6</td>
<td>405.7</td>
<td>404.8</td>
<td>403.9</td>
<td>402.10</td>
<td>401.11</td>
<td>400.12</td>
<td>399.13</td>
<td>400.14</td>
<td>399.15</td>
<td>400.16</td>
<td>399.17</td>
<td>400.18</td>
<td>399.19</td>
<td>400.20</td>
<td>399.21</td>
<td>400.22</td>
<td>399.23</td>
<td>400.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Coaching Fellowship</td>
<td>554.16</td>
<td>553.17</td>
<td>552.18</td>
<td>551.19</td>
<td>550.20</td>
<td>549.21</td>
<td>548.22</td>
<td>547.23</td>
<td>546.24</td>
<td>545.25</td>
<td>544.26</td>
<td>543.27</td>
<td>542.28</td>
<td>541.29</td>
<td>540.30</td>
<td>539.31</td>
<td>538.32</td>
<td>537.33</td>
<td>536.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>239.11</td>
<td>238.12</td>
<td>237.13</td>
<td>236.14</td>
<td>235.15</td>
<td>234.16</td>
<td>233.17</td>
<td>232.18</td>
<td>231.19</td>
<td>230.20</td>
<td>229.21</td>
<td>228.22</td>
<td>227.23</td>
<td>226.24</td>
<td>225.25</td>
<td>224.26</td>
<td>223.27</td>
<td>222.28</td>
<td>221.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Science Master's</td>
<td>47.19</td>
<td>47.18</td>
<td>47.17</td>
<td>47.16</td>
<td>47.15</td>
<td>47.14</td>
<td>47.13</td>
<td>47.12</td>
<td>47.11</td>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>59.36</td>
<td>59.35</td>
<td>59.34</td>
<td>59.33</td>
<td>59.32</td>
<td>59.31</td>
<td>59.30</td>
<td>59.29</td>
<td>59.28</td>
<td>59.27</td>
<td>59.26</td>
<td>59.25</td>
<td>59.24</td>
<td>59.23</td>
<td>59.22</td>
<td>59.21</td>
<td>59.20</td>
<td>59.19</td>
<td>59.18</td>
<td>59.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>548.31</td>
<td>548.32</td>
<td>548.33</td>
<td>548.34</td>
<td>548.35</td>
<td>548.36</td>
<td>548.37</td>
<td>548.38</td>
<td>548.39</td>
<td>548.40</td>
<td>548.41</td>
<td>548.42</td>
<td>548.43</td>
<td>548.44</td>
<td>548.45</td>
<td>548.46</td>
<td>548.47</td>
<td>548.48</td>
<td>548.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>38.25</td>
<td>38.24</td>
<td>38.23</td>
<td>38.22</td>
<td>38.21</td>
<td>38.20</td>
<td>38.19</td>
<td>38.18</td>
<td>38.17</td>
<td>38.16</td>
<td>38.15</td>
<td>38.14</td>
<td>38.13</td>
<td>38.12</td>
<td>38.11</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>38.09</td>
<td>38.08</td>
<td>38.07</td>
<td>38.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.75</td>
<td>27.74</td>
<td>27.73</td>
<td>27.72</td>
<td>27.71</td>
<td>27.70</td>
<td>27.69</td>
<td>27.68</td>
<td>27.67</td>
<td>27.66</td>
<td>27.65</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td>27.63</td>
<td>27.62</td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>27.60</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>27.58</td>
<td>27.57</td>
<td>27.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenses with Graduate Program**
Appendix E
Comments
Dear Greg and Chris,

Greetings! We have perused the draft Graduate Prioritization Report made public on Tuesday, September 2. On behalf of the Women's Studies Program, we would like to ask for explanation/clarification concerning how Women's Studies is categorized in the report. After reading the report and all the attachments closely, we note that, according to the weighted score, WMS should have been placed in Category 2, but it appears in Category 3. This distinction is significant due to the potential additional resources associated with Category 2. There are two possibilities that we would like to address: the first is that a simple error has been made and the second is that a decision was made to place the program in Category 3 despite our score.

The first instance is the more likely and the easier to address. We request that, if an error has been made, WMS (total weighted score, 648.60) be realigned in Category 2 between Education (659.01) and Environmental Education (647.32), the place where the score falls. If, on the other hand, a decision was made to place WMS in Category 3 despite the score, we ask for an explanation of this decision especially in light of the fact that WMS appears to be the only program that got lowered from its original placement. We were unable to locate an explanation in the narrative portion of the report that addresses this issue.

We understand those in Category 3 are considered “adequately enrolled, likely at or near demand capacity.” To be sure, Women’s Studies at SCSU has room to grow, and we are not at capacity. In fact, because of this, we eagerly look forward to launching the MSW/WMS dual-degree program and accepting its first cohort for fall 2015. This dual-degree program, one of the few in the country, will be the only one offered outside of the Midwest—the three currently in existence are at Loyola University, Chicago; University of Louisville; and University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee. Indeed, it is with the room to grow in mind that we have recently launched the WMS Online Graduate Certificate, which will continue to attract online graduate students.
We thank you and our colleagues on the Graduate Prioritization Committee, and look forward to receiving your response.

Sincerely,

Tricia

P.S. I also copy all my WMS Steering Committee colleagues: Rosalyn Amenta, Brandon Hutchinson, Sobeira Latorre, Heidi Lockwood, Jane McGinn, and Ginny Metaxas.

Yi-Chun Tricia Lin 林怡君, Ph.D.
Director & Professor, Women's Studies Program
Southern Connecticut State University
President, National Women's Studies Association 2012-2014

E-mail: linyk@southernct.edu
Office: (203) 392-6133; (203) 392-6864
Fax: (203) 392-6723

www.southernct.edu/womensstudies

"Women, Community, Technology" -- 22nd SCSU Women's Studies Conference -- April 2016 on the Campus of SCSU
Good afternoon Dean Pavez:
This is a low priority question, but one that continues to stay on my mind.

The MS Program in Bilingual Education and TESOL received a low score for #7: Rev. & Other Resources generated by the Program.
This low score surprised me, as I thought that category may well be one of our strengths, given that our program generates on average 1.5 million dollars every five years, through the US Dept of Ed Training for All Teachers Program. I entered this information in the text of this questions category, but some of this category was scored by internal institutional data, if I am correct. Can you help make sense of how/why our program scored so low in this category?

Thanks, Dean.

Lorrie Stoops Verplaetse, Ph.D.
Professor, Coordinator of TESOL & Bilingual Education
Director, Training for All Teachers Program
Southern CT State University
Engleman Hall, D-170, 501 Crescent Street
New Haven, CT 06515
203 392 6759
Dear Dean Paveza - School of Graduate Studies;

Thank you for your report on the prioritization graduate studies. After reading the report I felt that the report reads like US News and World Report in that it is based on the hottest fields right now to obtain a job. I was disappointed due to the fact that this report is not, in my opinion, a "prioritization" but a hot field report. I am not sure that some of the fields selected will stand the test of time and serve our institution the best. I would like to finish that my responses are not due to the lower ranking of exercise science as a priority. I just wish that the prioritization was carried out under a better or insightful way.

Regards;

David S. Kemler, Ph.D.
Hello fearless GPP leaders!

I am afraid my logic rambles a bit, but the big idea is that I think I may have figured out a possible answer to my lingering question as to why the 6th year programs and EdD showed up as more expensive in the GPP process and therefore were lower in the ranking. It was a systemic thing, but not something that we logically would have been able to plan for...

Here is the wandering logic:
I was driving by the future long warf campus and thinking how it could have been a great Professional Development, 6th year/EdD space (possibilities for Conference spaces for the Doctoral programs etc., a center for research support at the EdD level- all sorts of great stuff) partially because the EDL students don’t share classes with any undergraduates.

THEN it occurred to me! None of the EdD or 6th year programs share any undergraduate courses. When we did the finance reporting the programs that shared classes with undergraduates had partial costs for those two heavily weighted items. It was logical when we were designing the metrics. Those programs do serve both, so it makes sense that only a portion of the costs are graduate. BUT when we are comparing just the graduate elements, then it doesn’t make sense.

So my point is, I think the committee made the right call for the first run at the GPP with the financial data, but I also think we should run it with full costs for all programs to see what the impact is of programs that have shared classes (4+1, cross listed, whatever) with undergraduates. This may reveal that we have to look at these programs in two groups to compare apples to apples.

Finally, while I do not speak for anyone but myself, I think that the Long Warf Campus could be an amazing Advanced Professional Campus serving the programs that are exclusively graduate in a setting that has resources and classrooms that are geared towards adult learners. I see it as an opportunity to offer more programming to the area in terms of professional development, workshops and conferences with the space to do that.

I do not wish for the commute back and forth to participate in meetings, but when I put my own needs below the needs of students.

Thanks for taking the time to read this,
Jess

Jess Gregory, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Southern Connecticut State University
TE-6, Room 123

gregoryj2@southernct.edu
203 392 5324
Supplemental Documents
September 15, 2014

Dear Dean Breese, Dean Paveza, Dean Hegedus, Provost Bergeron, and President Papazian;

The SCSU Art Department would like to share this Statement in Support of Its Program in Art Education

Some confusion may exist within the University community regarding the Art Department’s attitude toward its own Art Education program. Let it be known that the Art Department unambiguously supports the maintenance of a vibrant Art Education program serving both undergraduate and graduate students within the Art Department. The Art Education Program serves vital functions within the public University system. By providing students with an affordable means of attaining credentials required for teaching in our public schools, it contributes significantly to our State’s economic and cultural development. Attrition over the past several years has grievously shrunk the size of the Art Education faculty. That is why the program now urgently needs additional staffing and leadership. The Art Department will do all in its power to assure that the Art Education program receives the institutional support that it requires and looks forward to raising objection before appropriate bodies to an alternative plan contained in the recent Graduate Program Prioritization report.

Most Sincerely,

The Art Department
Response to Program Prioritization Findings and Report

The Master of Science in Reading and the Sixth Year in Reading programs received a recommendation to continue funding at the current level. When looking closely at the disaggregated scoring rubric, we scored exceptionally well on sections such as Quality of Program Outcomes (105.07, Masters; 104.05, Sixth year) and very well in all other areas - with the exception of “Revenue and Other Resources Generated by Program,” where we were given a low score of 8.4. Further, when looking at additional areas such as External Demand for Program, our rankings were as high or higher as many of the graduate programs identified in the first quintile.

Being ranked at level three surprised us. First, areas such as Outcomes & External Demand (15.6% & 14.7%, respectively) contributed significantly more to the overall percentage for rank than did revenue (8.4%). Second, a trend emerged within the SOE some years ago to offer cohorts because of their potential for cost effectiveness. In light of this, the graduate reading program made a commitment to offer cohorts in East Lyme and Newtown despite the many logistical challenges that can emerge with this sort of work. In general, each of these cohort programs have had at least ten students (and as many as twenty) since they first started in 2011. Finally, we are offering a new cohort beginning in January 2015; 20 teachers in the greater New Haven area have already enrolled. Because this cohort will meet on campus, there are no additional costs related to site use or faculty travel.

We also wonder whether part of this low score may have been due to our providing the services of our Reading Clinics to the New Haven community free of any charges; we are one of the few (or only clinics) on campus that have historically maintained a “no fee” schedule for our families who are often struggling with a variety of demands that make even a $10.00 session charge prohibitive. Ultimately, our response to this score, in part, is to maintain our commitment to serving children regardless of their families’ financial resources. We are located in an urban area whose outcomes are far below those of wealthier districts. We are committed to doing what we can to serve any child in New Haven who may benefit from our Reading Clinics. Courses through which we offer clinics are practicums that have lower enrollment caps than a typical lecture course; this type of experience, however, is mandated by the state for reading certification. The value of the experience is also closely tied to the intensive supervision and support offered by the faculty who teach these classes, which requires a decreased class size.

Finally, we have been diligent in applying for large and small grants, and we are awaiting word on a large IES grant in revision, and another grant related to the use of adaptive technology and reading instruction. Both of these grants, if awarded, create revenue for the university while also allowing for essential research.

For these reasons, we disagree with this 8.4 score in the area of revenue and believe that our small but highly regarded program is worthy of increased support.

Sincerely,
Prof. Regine Randall, Coordinator of Graduate Reading
Prof. Laura Raynolds
Prof. Maravene (Beth) Taylor-Roscow
Department of Biology
Graduate Program Prioritization Report Rebuttal

Dr. Sarah Crawford, Biology Department Graduate Program Coordinator

March 4, 2015

In response to recommendations made by the Prioritization Committee at SCSU in regard to the Graduate Program in Biology, the following proposed changes/additions to our program are respectfully submitted for review:

- Professional Master of Science Degree (PSM) in Biology with concentrations in Molecular Biology/Biotechnology or Environmental Sciences.

- “4+1” Biology Program for a combined BS/MS Degree.

- Biotechnology Certificate Program: Post-baccalaureate 9-12 credit program in applied bioscience specialization.

Each of these programs is outlined in further detail below.

**Professional Master of Science (PSM) Degree**

The proposed Professional Master of Science (PSM) Degree in Biology will provide an applied addition to the current traditional Master's Degree Program in Biology that is currently offered. The goal of the applied PSM Program will be to provide graduate students with the advanced study and training necessary to conduct independent research at a professional level and to be successful in today's competitive academic and industrial research markets. Students in the program will be encouraged to explore quantitative approaches to the solution of problems in the basic and applied biological sciences. Depending on their career goals, students may choose either the Molecular Biology/Biotechnology track or the Environmental Sciences Technology track. All candidates for the master's degree are expected to demonstrate sufficient knowledge and skills to pursue independent and creative research activities.

The proposed Professional Science Master's Program (PSM) will combine traditional training in biological sciences with additional preparation in areas outside of traditional biology, such as project management and discipline-specific courses, to provide students with a broader expertise useful for attaining positions in private-sector companies. A thesis is not required, but each student must participate in a professional internship.

Two Professional Science Master's options will be available:
• Applied Biotechnology/Molecular Biology
• Applied Environmental Science Technology

The core curriculum will offer extensive hands-on experience in current techniques and instrumentation. Field trips and seminars will afford students an opportunity for interaction with the biotechnology industry. Students will be encouraged to conduct research in one of the recognized areas of biotechnology/environmental science technology or to present an innovative application of technology or engineering principles to a biological problem of economic interest. Both PSM tracks will include a required professional internship (one semester minimum).

**Applied Biotechnology Professional Science Master's (PSM)**

Some potential core course options:

- Cell Biology, Stem Cell Biology, Cell Culture, Molecular Biology/Laboratory,
- Immunology/Laboratory, Microbiology/Laboratory, Biotechnology/Laboratory
- Professional Communication in Science and Technology

**Additional Biology Courses - Applied Biotechnology PSM Option**

- Advances in Plant Biology, Cancer Biology, Cell Biology, Developmental Biology,
- Human Neurobiology, Stem Cell Biology, Virology, Microbiology, Recombinant Protein Production, Genomics Laboratory

**Potential Core Requirements Environmental Biotechnology PSM Option**

- Applied Statistics, Intro to Biostatistics and Epidemiology, Environmental Microbiology, Environmental Biochemistry, Professional Communication in Science and Technology

**Potential Advanced Environmental Biotechnology/Interdisciplinary Courses**

- Environmental Aquatic Chemistry, Environmental Fate and Transport Biological Wastewater Treatment, Hazardous Waste Site Remediation, Bioinformatics Lecture/Lab, Biology of Global Change, Advances in Plant Biology, Advanced Invertebrate Zoology Lecture, Bioaerosols in Health and Biodefense, Infectious Disease Epidemiology

Some of these courses will be new courses and others are current Biology Department course offerings that will be included in the new curriculum. The sum of core and
elective courses must total at least 30 credits.

"4+1" Combined BS/MS Program

The "4+1" Program will allow undergraduate students in the Biology Department to pursue a course in academic studies that will facilitate the attainment of the combined degree in approximately 5 years, including summer sessions. Students will complete the required coursework for an undergraduate degree and, once they have attained mastery of required undergraduate courses, may pursue graduate credits in biology (approximately 10 courses) spaced over several years to meet the requirements of this program. The goals of this program are several-fold. First, it will increase awareness of the graduate program among undergraduate students and encourage them to think ahead about their future and the role of an advanced degree in helping them to achieve their long-term professional objectives. Secondly, it offers a condensed timeframe to attain important academic goals that may be attractive to older students, highly motivated students and students with well defined career objectives. Thirdly, the program addresses an important academic reality, i.e., that a BS degree is often insufficient by itself to obtain employment in the sciences.

The proposed program will comprise a five-year combined Bachelor of Science and Master of Science Degree Program in Biology. This program is designed to allow students to receive both B.S. and M.S. degree in Biology in five years, as compared to six years needed to complete these degrees separately. This will be accomplished by offering a supervised and seamless transition from the B.S. curriculum to the M.S. curriculum. The goal is to better enable our graduates to prepare for competitive positions in today’s job market and/or admission to doctoral level graduate or professional schools.

The B.S./M.S. combined curriculum will consist of all required courses for the B.S. in Biology, in addition to all of the current graduate course requirements for the traditional Master’s program. The traditional B.S. in Biology degree requires 120 credits and the M.S. in Biology degree requires 30 credits, for a total of 150 credits. The proposed combined program will allow students to use 9 credits of graduate level courses approved by the Graduate Advisor or the Graduate Coordinator of the Department of Biological Sciences to satisfy both the B.S. and M.S. graduation requirements. This will reduce the number of required credits for the combined B.S./M.S. degree to 141 and making it possible for qualified students to complete both degrees in five years.
Students in this program will receive their B.S. degree upon completion of the undergraduate curriculum and their M.S. degree later upon completion of the graduate curriculum requirements.

The graduate portion of the combined program will offer both thesis and non-thesis options. Students who intend to pursue a Ph.D. degree in Biological Sciences are strongly advised to choose the thesis option. However, additional semesters may be required to complete a thesis research project.

Preliminary admission requirements to this program:

- Current undergraduate student at SCSU with a minimum of 80 credits toward B.S. in Biology degree
- Minimum 3.0 GPA
- B- or higher grade in all completed biology majors courses

Final Admission to the Graduate Program:

After receiving conditional admission to the program, the student is required to submit a Plan of Study for the M.S. in Biology degree. Nine credits of graduate level courses, which are used to satisfy both B.S. and M.S. in Biology degree requirements, must be identified on both the undergraduate and graduate Plan of Study and approved by the Graduate Advisor or the Graduate Coordinator of the Department of Biological Sciences prior to the last semester of the undergraduate study. Final admission to the graduate program is determined after completion of all course requirements for the B.S. in Biology degree.

Requirements for final admission to the graduate program

1. Minimum 3.0 overall GPA
2. B- or higher grade in all biology core courses
3. B- or higher grade in each of the graduate courses (9 credits) approved for both B.S. and M.S. Plan of Study.

GRE Waiver Application for this combined degree program does not need GRE scores.

Biotechnology Graduate Certificate Program

The proposed certificate program will be a post-baccalaureate training program to prepare students for careers in biotechnology with applications to the biotech, pharmaceutical and healthcare industries. Students with an undergraduate degree in
biology will be eligible for enrollment in this intensive training program that will include the following areas:

- Research methods using biotechnology tools;
- Clinical diagnostic techniques including disease and pathogen screening, genomics and single gene assessment using molecular methods;
- Laboratory/research program management

Proposed courses would include:

- Advanced laboratory training in biotechnology/molecular biology
- Advanced molecular genetics: principles and practice
- Clinical research methods

The certificate program will involve 9-12 course credit requirement and will be highlighted as a summer program to attract students from the southwestern region of Connecticut who have earned undergraduate degrees in biology but require professional training to achieve career goals in the biotechnology field.
I am writing on behalf of the Department of Sociology to demonstrate our unwavering support of the M.S. Sociology program. Identified as the second ranked program in quintile five per the Graduate Program Prioritization Report, we fear our program is in jeopardy of withdrawal of university support. This rebuttal aims to address what we agree are gaps in the original prioritization report that led to a rating lower than what we believe represents the true caliber and value of the M.S. Sociology program here at Southern. As such, several categories of the original review are redressed below. Foremost, the Department of Sociology wishes you to know that we are hard at work improving the value and efficiency of the M.S. Sociology program. Our plans include a program revision emphasizing social justice and equality with expectations to draw in criminal justice workers in addition to our traditional student body of social service and non-profit agency workers. Such a revision would align the M.S. Sociology degree with our renewed focus on criminology and deviance in the undergraduate program, increasing additional opportunities to recruit SCSU undergraduates into the master’s program as well. Further, we are taking pains to improve efficiency in course enrollment. We plan to increase cross-listed coursework with the objective of making more sections available more frequently given existing constraints. For example, we will cross-list “Research Methods in Social Science” with the M.S. Political Science program this upcoming fall. We will also collaborate with other university programs to ensure course rotations and course schedules (e.g. days/times) meet the needs of such programs whenever possible (e.g. “Race and Ethnic Relations” with Social Work).

History, Development and Expectations of the Program

The present M.S. Sociology program curriculum and expectations demand students’ rigorous engagement in the study of sociological research methods and theory. These skills and sociological training are designed to present graduates of the program with the skills necessary to serve them in their respective fields, most often social service agencies and non-profit organizations. According to alumni email (appended) and survey results (included in original prioritization report), we do this quite well. The current curriculum also exposes students to the field of applied sociology which further aims to relate coursework with a student’s present or future field of employment. Recent (2014-15) discussion within the Sociology Department Graduate Advisory Committee (GAC) and the Department Curriculum
Committee (DCC) has been focused on how to increase applied sociology coursework in the degree to better attract applicants in the aforementioned fields. We are presently developing a program revision to address this.

Elective coursework builds on the strengths of the current full-time faculty including race and ethnic relations, social stratification and inequality, social institutions and social deviance. Historically we were heavily involved in educating criminal justice workers (e.g. law enforcement including police, security officers, and probation officers). Due to the death of one full-time colleague and the retirement of another, the Department of Sociology has been unable to regularly offer popular coursework in criminology and deviance (6 elective courses). Students and alumni lament the dearth of such course sections. Graduate coordinators have had to identify the irregularity of criminology coursework with potential applicants, resulting in a decline in applicants and admissions. At present the Department of Sociology is undertaking an employment search for a criminologist whom we anticipate will ensure our graduate program can again regularly offer this important coursework.

Lastly, the development of the aforementioned program revision represents agreement within the department to build upon the expressed student interests in social inequality/justice and crime/deviance (as identified in student and alumni survey and solicited program feedback), faculty strengths, and regional and national conversations aimed to redress social injustice. We envision refocusing the graduate program in the areas of social justice and equality. The program will provide graduates with the methodological and theoretical skills needed to participate in a meaningful way in conversations and policymaking on issues of social justice and equality (e.g. School-to-prison pipeline, mass incarceration, policing and police repression, civil and human rights, undocumented immigration, segregated communities and public schools, social welfare policy and poverty…). All courses will incorporate principles of applied or “public” sociology to connect what is learned in the classroom with real world experiences in both the private and public spheres. A community-level focus will be paramount. This curriculum will be distinct from undergraduate level criminology and criminal justice programs in the state, ensuring an opportunity for graduate program recruitment.

Quality of Program Inputs and Processes

Faculty Qualifications: The Department of Sociology is fortunate to employ five full-time sociologists, each of whom regularly teaches in the M.S. Sociology program. Additionally, we periodically employ three part-time sociologists with doctorates in sociology as well as four others with master’s diplomas in sociology and/or criminology and two more with juris doctorates. Our faculty consistently teaches within individual research interests or fields of expertise. Again, the program would benefit from hiring a criminologist as, in recent years, these courses have been taught, in part, by adjunct faculty and full-time faculty whose research interests fall afield from criminology. See the following examples below for further insight as to the expertise and teaching interests of graduate faculty:

- Dr. Gregory Adams (Full-time), a quantitative sociologist and expert in social deviance most recently taught “Sociology of Deviant Behavior,” “Crime and the
Criminal,” and “Quantitative Research in Sociology.” His most recent publication, “A Day in the Life: Time-use, employment, and drug access among opiate addicts in Ukraine” was published in the peer reviewed Journal of Sociology and Social Work;

- Dr. Jon Bloch (Full-time), a sociologist engaged in two decades worth of research on religion as well as masculinity, historically taught coursework in the “Sociology of Religion.” “Applied Sociological Theory,” “Society and the Individual,” and the “Sociology of Gender.” Due to the paucity of faculty able to teach in the field of criminology and a surplus of faculty capable of teaching the fields of theory, religion and gender, Dr. Bloch has volunteered to teach “Crime and the Criminal”;

- Robin Esposito (adjunct), holds a juris doctorate and most recently taught “Juvenile Delinquency”;

- Dr. Shirley Jackson (Full-time), an expert in race relations as well as community studies, regularly teaches “Race and Ethnic Relations,” “Race, Class and Gender,” and “Community Sociology” all areas in which she is published (e.g. forthcoming chapter “When Enough is Enough: African American Women Reclaiming Themselves” in Letting Go: Feminist and Social Justice Insights and Activism);

- Dr. Jessica Kenty-Drane (Full-time) regularly teaches “Sociology of Education” which draws upon her ongoing research on educational inequality including her published research titled “Early Isolation: Racial and Economic Segregation in U.S. Public Elementary Schools” in the peer reviewed journal Race, Gender & Class and her current research on voluntary contributions in public schools;

- Dr. Martin Laskin (adjunct), a sociologist who conducts research in Judaic studies, regularly teaches “Sociology of Religion” as well as “Society and the Individual” in which he draws upon his micro-level ethnographic work on conservative synagogues as discussed in his book An Ethnographic Study of an American Conservative Synagogue.

- Dr. Charles Lemert (adjunct), a retired Wesleyan professor, renowned sociologist and prolific social theorist (author or co-author of some 24 books), has taught “Applied Sociological Theory” each of the last two times it was offered, providing a unique opportunity to study sociological theory with one of but a few identifiable social theorists living in the U.S. today;

- Dr. Cassi Meyerhoffer (Full-time), who most recently published the results of her qualitative project in the Sociology of Race and Ethnicity, is an expert in qualitative research methods and most recently taught “Research Methods” and “Qualitative Research Methods.” She is presently writing a manuscript on qualitative methods to be submitted for publication in Qualitative Methods, a peer reviewed journal in sociology;

**Merit & Logic of Curriculum:** The M.S. Sociology curriculum emphasizes sound training in social science research methods as well as sociological theory. Three of six core courses focus on research methods, two on sociological theory with the final requirement, “Community Sociology,” serving as a professional level introduction to applied or “public” sociology bridging sociological theory with life in the community. The core coursework ensures a foundation in the empirical and theoretical approach to understanding social institutions and social issues covered in the elective coursework. Further, core and elective coursework prepare students for their capstone requirement which is divided fairly evenly within our
graduates between theses and comprehensive exams. Most thesis students are primarily interested in advanced graduate study beyond the master’s and they often present in regional conferences as well as seek out opportunities to engage in work as teaching and research assistants. Thesis requires close working relationships with faculty and the high caliber of recent theses demonstrates just how valuable this time has been. Students who complete the comprehensive exams rely heavily on their coursework and faculty to prepare them for success and they too must work collaboratively within the department to ensure they are adequately prepared.

Program Dynamism: In addition to the program evaluation measures identified in the prioritization report, the Department of Sociology invites further engagement of the Graduate Advisory Committee to facilitate admissions as well as ongoing program evaluation and revision. The present graduate coordinator is committed to improving communication among program faculty as well between the program itself and students. Enhanced communication should facilitate improved coordination of course offerings to meet student expectations in terms of on-ground, hybrid and online coursework as well as semester schedules that ensure students are on campus at intervals (i.e. days of the week) and times (i.e. 5:00-7:30 versus 7:35-10:05) that ensure not only academic success but also facilitate important considerations of student work-life balance. Lastly, improved communication will encourage discourse on further cross-listing of coursework and identification of elective coursework relevant to external programs (e.g. “Race & Ethnic Relations” or “Race, Class & Gender”).

Quality of Program Outcomes

Use of Assessment Data: The 2008 M.S. Sociology program review (i.e. data and program goals) was used as an important document to continue program success and redress inadequacies. Here are some of the most notable actions that came as a result of our prior program review:

- Student planned programs, previously in flux due to inadequate or unpredictable course offering, were stabilized with the implementation of a consistent rotation plan for both core and elective coursework;
- Student scholarly activity was encouraged through faculty promotion of thesis research, GRF/GSGA funding applications, and encouragement to participate in regional conferences. The Graduate Student Professional Activity document was distributed annually to students between 2008-2011, and a newsletter was implemented in 2011-12 to the present in order to promote the tracking and promotion of student scholarship. This data was used to both assess program success as well as improve student participation in scholarly activities;
- To enhance cohesion within the graduate student body various events were held to facilitate student engagement and relationships with faculty. These include open house events, brown-bag lecture series, and annual graduate student dinners. More should be done to bolster program allegiance, cohort relationships, student-faculty interaction and intellectual engagement;
- We continue to advocate for a tenure-track sociologist search to increase the capacity of our department to offer what we promise our applicants. We have a search underway for a sociologist with expertise in criminology and deviance;
• Graduate students have presented in conferences and applied for SCSU GRF and GSGA fellowships each year since our last program review in 2008;
• We have installed data analysis software in the shared Sociology/Anthropology department computer lab for students to access in their thesis and coursework (i.e. SPSS, STATA, and NVIVO as of spring 2015).

In fall 2014 the Department of Sociology faculty requested alumni letters of support and critique for the M.S. Sociology program. We received 9 such letters (appended) and are reviewing this feedback now as we draft a proposal for a revised M.S. Sociology program in social justice and equality.

Size, scope and productivity of the program

There was a decline in credits generated in the 2010-11 academic year and this is due to a significant reduction in sections offered from 8 in 2008-09 down to 5 in 2010-11. This reduction is due to then Dean of Arts and Science’s decision not to permit our program to offer 6-8 courses a year. While the decision was made with hopes of increasing course enrollments, it is imperative to note that no Sociology courses had been cancelled due to low enrollment. Rather, the decision was made during the semester scheduling cycle, one year in advance of the term. This decision adversely affected our course rotation plan and recruitment strategies and also increased current student dissatisfaction with course offerings. The Department of Sociology is already demonstrating success, at the undergraduate level, in reversing declining enrollments (enrolled majors) through concerted recruitment efforts and curricular development.

Impact, justification and overall essentiality of the program

The state of Connecticut, despite inordinate levels of personal and corporate wealth, is grappling with significant economic pressures due, in part, to widespread social inequities including one of the largest income and wealth gaps in the U.S. and extreme racial segregation in housing and education. Graduates of the M.S. Sociology program enter a social service system that often introduces social policy and procedures devoid of contextual awareness of larger social forces. Our program ensures that not only will our graduates recognize the sociological factors, but they are poised to initiate these conversations and inform practice as they are well trained in methodology and social theory. Given that the majority of our alumni remain in the state, Connecticut enjoys this significant contribution. We agree with the prioritization report that our program can do more, hence the proposed program revision in the area of social justice and equality. Once completed, the revision will ensure our program is one of distinction in the state and the northeast. This new vision will also provide a platform for faculty, alumni and students to participate in local, state and national conversations on social inequality and social justice (e.g. mass incarceration, decriminalization, housing policy, educational reform, discrimination…).

Opportunity analysis of the program
**External Opportunities:** The Department of Sociology is committed to offering a cutting-edge program to ensure our graduates are prepared to successfully participate in important conversations on remedying untenable disparities in the public sector. We anticipate a full on recruitment effort once the program revision is completed and an implementation date is confirmed (2015-16). We will recruit new students from existing social service fields including criminal justice, social work, social service services, non-profit agencies, government and education. We expect to bring together cohorts of students who seek to impart the wisdom and insights of sociological theory and social science research into their respective fields. This revision will ensure a degree that includes more applied sociological training such that students will have practical experience in community engagement and a network of social contacts to draw upon as they move forward in their career.

**Internal Opportunities:** This graduate program will distinguish itself from our undergraduate sociology major with its concentration on social justice and with its applied focus. Further, this revised program will distinguish itself from the more general studies students are engaged in across the social science disciplines. Hence, we anticipate increased recruitment from the SCSU student body. For the same reasons, we also expect this recruitment will be successful across CSU institutions.

**Conclusion**

We welcome the opportunity to further discuss the M.S. Sociology program and the development of a proposed program revision emphasizing Social Justice and Equality.

Cc: Dean Breese, College of Arts & Sciences, Gregory Adams, Chair, Department of Sociology
Hello Dr. Jackson (You will always be Dr. Jackson to me), First I apologize for the delay in responding to your email as I have not checked this particular email in more than 2 weeks. I only use it for my Igbo Life Series which I am currently taking a break before starting the next title.

How nice to hear from you. I was just thinking about you just last week.

I am glad to learn that your MS program is still going and hope that it continues to offer students like me the opportunity to partake in a rigorous Soc program at the the graduate level. Thanks to your mentorship and for professors like Dr. Jon Bloch, I received a great education at SCSU. The education I received in the MS program in Soc provided me with a solid foundation in research and methodology which enabled me to pursue and successfully complete doctoral work at WSCU.

Please let me know of anyway that I can help to keep the program alive.

Pat Anekwe

On Fri, Nov 07, 2014 at 9:06 AM, Jackson, Shirley A. wrote:

Patricia (or shall I say, Dr. Anekwe!),

What a pleasure it is to hear about all of the wonderful things you have been doing since you left the master’s program in sociology at SCSU! I am so very proud of you!

The Sociology Department is undergoing its department review in the spring. We are hoping to have students who have been in the program and received their M.S. degrees assist by providing a testimonial of sorts to their experiences in the program. One of the reasons for our interest in having students give their feedback is that we are hoping to revise our graduate program. At the same time, several programs at SCSU are possibly facing elimination or being combined with other programs.

I am hoping that the revised program I am working on will help. It is long in coming and very much needed. With that said, anything you would like to say about your experiences would be helpful.

I hope all is well with the family and with you. Take care.

Shirley (no more Dr. Jackson for you since you are now a colleague!) Shirley A. Jackson, Ph.D.
Professor of Sociology
Co-Coordinator, Ethnic Studies Minor
Graduate Program Coordinator, Department of Sociology
department of sociology
Engleman Hall C 026D
501 Crescent Street
Southern Connecticut State University
New Haven, CT 06515
203-392-5676; 203-392-7087 (fax)
Editor of
The Routledge International Handbook of Race, Class, and Gender
http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415632713/

The first time someone shows you who they are, believe them. Maya Angelou
Sarah Blake
SCSU Soc Masters Program Testimonial

I was a graduate student in the SCSU Sociology Masters program from the Fall of 2005 to the Spring of 2007. I very much enjoyed my time in the program and believe that it provided a strong foundation for my next step as a Ph.D. student. A major strength of program at Southern is the professors. They are always available and very open to working with students. During my time in the program, I worked most closely with Dr. Jackson and Dr. Bloch, both of whom encouraged exploration into all areas of sociology.

As my thesis advisor, Dr. Jackson provided invaluable guidance. She not only provided important feedback on my thesis (which has made me a much stronger writer), but taught me what it means to be an academic and a sociologist. Her guidance helped me to understand that there is more to being a sociologist than a completing a thesis or a dissertation- a sociologist is someone who is actively engaged in his or her research, in understanding his or her community from a sociological perspective and in spreading knowledge about these sociological issues.

Dr. Jackson’s Community Sociology class is what I would consider my first experience with public sociology. She actually brought us into the surrounding community so that we could apply what we were learning in the classroom to real life examples. This is something that I strive to do as a teacher myself, apply real life examples to sociological concepts.

Dr. Bloch was also on my thesis committee, but I worked most closely with him through an independent study. I was interested in the sociology of sport, which was not offered as a course in the department, and Dr. Bloch agreed to advise me in an independent study of the subject, even though this is not his area of interest. I think this speaks to the sociology faculty’s commitment to students. His willingness to support my interests undoubtedly created extra work for him, but allowed me to explore an area of sociology that I was unfamiliar with and fostered my interest in the field as a whole.

Besides the independent study, one of Dr. Bloch’s classes in particular stands out in my mind. He taught a course called the Sociology of Self, which focused on micro level interactionist theory. This is one of my favorite classes that I have taken in graduate school. I use his final paper assignment, a sociological autobiography, as an assignment in one of the courses that I teach. I think that having students apply sociological theories to their own lives is one of the best ways for them to understand these theories. This course, and Dr. Bloch’s regular sociological theory course, provide a strong theoretical background for graduate students.

A second course that I found very beneficial was Dr. Edelman’s Qualitative Methods course. Dr. Edelman’s course was a hands on approach to qualitative methods. We did not just read about how to be a qualitative researcher, or simply submit a research proposal, we actually engaged in qualitative methods. I believe this is the best way to learn a research method, and Dr. Edelman’s course provided a very strong foundation for my work as a Ph.D. student.

Overall, my experiences in the SCSU sociology master’s program were positive. My one suggestion would be a required statistics course. Statistics is such an important part of sociology, even if you are not a quantitative researcher, a cursory understanding of statistics is necessary just to fully understand articles within the field. I think a required statistics course would strengthen the program and be very beneficial to students.
Sarah Blake  
SCSU Soc Masters Program Testimonial  
The Masters program in Sociology provided me with a strong introduction to graduate level work and helped to shape me into a sociologist that is committed to students and is engaged in research not only at an academic level, but also at a community level.
October 14, 2014

Dear Dr. Kenty-Drane,

I have waited far too long to contact you with an update since earning a Master’s Degree in 2013. I am regretful that I neglected to share how life changed since the diploma arrived. When I consider the many students who have benefited from the department’s dedicated professors, it seems unfair that you never hear from some of us again and remain uninformed as to our progress.

As you may remember, I met with you in the summer of 2009 to begin the journey toward fulfilling a personal goal, earning a M.S. in Sociology. I was a returning student in my 50s and my goals mainly involved self-enrichment. I remember you were encouraging and helpful with creating an interesting plan that covered a wide spectrum of courses within the field. I knew I would be attending school with students who were my children’s peers and I had not written a paper in many years. Needless to say, I was terrified but determined. The fear I felt never left until graduation but lessened as I experienced success academically. With the support of the gifted Sociology professors I learned to think critically, to view society from a wider perspective, and understand social issues more deeply. The books I read and the graduate seminar discussions stimulated my brain and conscience. Most importantly, I gained confidence and found my voice. Once I learned I could regroup and grow after missteps, I discovered a world of possibilities. After failing miserably in the first weeks of a challenging course with Dr. Jackson, I worked harder and pushed myself well beyond my comfort zone. In the end, it became one of my favorite courses and instructors. There were days, nights and weekends, I spent working on projects, papers and my thesis. Sometimes I was exhausted and in tears feeling as if I would never finish, but more often I felt excited and challenged. When I was completed my degree requirements, the feeling of accomplishment was indescribable. I will always credit my professors with creating the stimulating academic atmosphere that kept me engaged and provided the encouragement to see it through to the finish line.

So what happened after the diploma?

The degree afforded me improved credentials but my education provided so much more. I learned lessons that extended beyond the classroom. For example, you instructed my first class, Research Methods. I quickly learned how to organize materials and began to understand the value of reading, research and forming cohesive thoughts to effectively communicate opinions. Dr. Eich-Krohm’s Gender Issues course awakened me through required readings and class discussions that prepared me for later personal and career growth. Just one of many lessons, I finally understood my passive approach was hindering me in every facet of life. After graduation, I networked, and spoke with colleagues about my desire to grow professionally. They responded by informing me of job openings within their department and urged me to apply.
I applied the lessons I learned while in the graduate program as I worked on a strong application and resume that resulted in an opportunity to interview for a coveted position. I prepared extensively and interviewed with self-assurance. In March of this year, I was hired as a Judicial Branch Family Relations Counselor in an office where the majority of my co-workers have professional degrees and certifications. However, the M.S. in Sociology holds equal value and I offer unique perspective that adds to the team as we work in both Criminal Court on domestic violence cases and in Family Court with divorce and child custody matters. I look forward to my work each day and I find it incredibly challenging and fulfilling. On the practical side, there is also increased pay, benefits and opportunities for professional development.

I am fully cognizant that none of this would have happened had I met with resistance when I took that first step in the summer of 2009. More importantly, I would never have completed the coursework and final thesis if not for the positive encouragement and support you and the other dedicated professors within the Sociology Department offer to students. Your efforts have changed my life in countless ways and I remain forever grateful. If you ever encounter a perspective student who is undecided about whether a Master’s Degree in Sociology is worth the effort, please ask them to contact me. I will happily share my thoughts and full endorsement.

Sincerely,

Kim DeMusis
I, Rakeya Gee-Thompson, am a 2008 alumni of SCSU’s M.S. program. It's saddens me to hear that the M.S Sociology program is in jeopardy of being eliminated.

Obtaining my M.S. has played an important role in my career. I am currently a Program Manager for a non for profit agency, Center for Human Development, in Hartford. I had no previous management experience when I applied to this position. However, by obtaining my Master’s degree in Sociology I displayed how passionate I am about the social service field, my commitment, and knowledge. As a result, I have been a successful manager for 2 years. I oversee 8 staff and 3 clients.

My experience in the master’s program was priceless. The faculty was dedicated and extremely understanding. They put 100% in making sure I received the best education. I am so grateful for the faculty and pleased that I obtained my Master's from Southern CT State University. It would be devastating to the future Sociologists, Social Workers, Human Service Workers, and others not to be able to gain quality education and benefit from a valuable program.

Thank you for your time.

Rakeya Gee, M.S.
Program Manager
Center for Human Development
Hartford, CT

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy ote® II, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone
Dr. Shirley Jackson  
Graduate Program Coordinator, Department of Sociology  
Southern Connecticut State University  
501 Crescent Street  
New Haven, CT 06515

To whom it may concern,

My name is Kaitlyn Kos, I am a 2013 graduate from the MS Sociology Program at Southern Connecticut State University. I chose to go to SCSU’s program because I was passionate about sociology and wanted the opportunity to learn more in that area. My undergraduate degree was in Secondary Social Studies education with a concentration in Sociology. During my time in undergrad, my course work did not allow the in-depth study of sociology I desired due to the education program I was in. At the time of applying to SCSU for the MS program I contemplated pursuing a Ph.D. however, I felt I would feel more comfortable with additional experience solely in the field of sociology first.

Once I started the program at SCSU my passion for sociology just continued to grow. I was able to take a variety of courses which peaked my interests in topics I knew very little about. It was obvious that the professors were passionate about their content area, but they were also very enthusiastic about us as students and our personal interests. They encouraged students to develop research proposals; whether it be a master’s thesis, a special project, or a comprehensive exam. They provided ample opportunity to practice multiple methodologies to ensure our research would be well-rounded and well-developed. Professors were also helpful in not just teaching the content of the course but also in the process of performing research; such as applying to the Institutional Review Board or applying for funding.

While at SCSU my classmates and I developed a Graduate club for all students in the Sociology program. The best part of that club was the involvement from the professors. They would join us at club meetings where we could go into more in-depth discussion about questions we had. It made no difference if it was about a topic we talked about in class or if we were questioning them on what step we should take next in our education path. All of my professors I view as amazing mentors whom I still reach out to for guidance two years later.

If this program were to make changes, I would advise to edit the list of courses offered in the program. A few of the courses I was interested in did not run due to low enrollment or not having a professor with that specialty. I know numerous classmates were disappointed in the course offerings for courses in the criminal justice field however, I would have also enjoyed more courses in Sociology of Education or even more in gender studies where it would be obvious on my transcript when I completed the program that I had a very clear focus area.

Since graduation I feel I have become more prepared for a career in Sociology or in an education related field. I feel my writing has improved immensely. Being able to collaborate with the faculty and with classmates has helped to enrich my academic, professional, and personal growth.

Sincerely,

Kaitlyn Kos, MS
Dr. Shirley Jackson  
Graduate Program Coordinator, Department of Sociology  
Southern Connecticut State University  
501 Crescent Street  /New Haven, CT 06515

December 30, 2014

Dear Dr. Jackson,

When I first applied to SCSU’s Sociology Graduate Program in 2010, I wasn’t sure what my long term goals were. I had taken a break after finishing my undergraduate degree, and found that I missed taking courses. SCSU’s program was attractive because I liked the idea of taking graduate courses without feeling pressured to complete a Ph.D. immediately afterwards. My only other in-state option would have been the University of Connecticut (who would have, no doubt, pushed me to complete a doctoral degree). I chose SCSU not only because I wanted to take stay in Connecticut, or because I know I prefer meeting in a classroom, but because SCSU seemed to be the only option for what I was seeking at that time.

My first semester there, I knew I had made the correct choice in both school and program. My courses focused in-depth on subjects I had just brushed upon in undergrad, and I found some of my favorite authors in the required class texts. I found myself looking forward to the classes and writing assignments. Even in statistics, a subject I typically dread, I was excited to meet at least once weekly with friends from my cohort to complete homework assignments (Statistics Unplugged is the only math textbook I have ever bothered to keep). I had originally opted to write a thesis, but the program was very flexible when I had requested last-minute to take the comprehensive exam for a prospective job that required a Master’s Degree by a certain date. Overall, my experiences with the program and the faculty were positive.

If this program were to ever be revamped, I have a few suggestions. I had enrolled with a focus of race/gender relations, but classes I was interested in were often cancelled due to low enrollment. For example, I had to take a class in the Women’s Studies program to fulfill an elective, when I would have much rather taken a Sociology course. Likewise, it seemed like there was an overwhelming interest in criminal justice, however very limited classes, if any, were offered. It would be helpful, because of the small size of the program, to advertise two or three focuses, instead of the four or five I remember reading about while I was a prospective student.

It’s been two years after I graduated from the program, and I am happy to continue to keep in touch with several members of my cohort, as well as some faculty and staff from SCSU. If it weren’t for this program, I would have been forced to enroll in UConn, begin an online program, or attend a school out of state. SCSU was the most logical option for me, and it turned out to be the best. I would unhesitatingly recommend you, the faculty, and this graduate program to anyone interested in pursuing their education in the field of sociology.

Very Sincerely Yours,

Samantha Kusiak

Samantha Kusiak, MS
Hi Jessica,

I hope you're doing well. Jon told me that SCSU grad program has come under fire, and is at risk of being cut. That really disheartens me. I wanted to say a few words about it. See my account below:

The Southern Connecticut State University graduate program in Sociology was crucial to my own success. It is the only reason that I hold a Ph.D. in Sociology from University of Connecticut, and have a tenure-track position in the SUNY system. This program could help others like me.

The Master of Science in Sociology from SCSU provides the bridge and middle step to students who cannot go directly into a Ph.D. program. An indirect route to academe can occur for many reasons, including those personal or monetary, and for poor undergraduate performance. My Master's in Sociology from SCSU launched me into the doctoral program in Sociology at University of Connecticut. For students who come into SCSU Sociology with aspirations to be a scholar, the intermediary step of the Master's is crucial.

The Master's in Sociology also benefits students with no intention to pursue academe. It provides an excellent way to advance their careers. It also equips those who work in applied fields (for example, in mental health and education) to develop a sociological imagination and sharpen their human services orientation.

Lastly, it is local, affordable, and offers courses in evenings. This is necessary, as people work during the day. Many workers and adult learners would not have access to higher education in the social sciences without this and similar programs across the country.

I really hope we can save the Master's degree in Sociology at Southern Connecticut State. It is so crucial to the success of working class Connecticut residents throughout the state.

--
Melissa F. Lavin, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Sociology
SUNY at Oneonta
Oneonta, NY 13820

To go in the dark with a light is to know the light.
To know the dark, go dark. Go without sight,
and find that the dark, too, blooms and sings,
and is traveled by dark feet and dark wings.

--Wendell Berry
First and foremost, I hope you reconsider your decision to eliminate the Sociology Master of Science program at Southern Connecticut State University. I cannot speak for everyone who graduated from the program but for me my degree has opened up many opportunities. There are not many programs that provide a Master of Science in Sociology and it was one of the determining factors that I chose SCSU.

The professors and the program enable me to complete an amazing research project about veterans returning back to school. SCSU program was small enough that I received undivided attention from my advisor during the formulation and writing my thesis. I don't believe I would have produced the same quality work if I did not receive the attention and the skills set from the Sociology department.

While working on my degree I received a scholarship for a Personal Financial Management certification. There were 250 people competing for 30 available scholarships worldwide and I was chosen due to my studies and getting a graduate degree.

After graduation, I was able to attain a government job to support military families in Japan. My Sociology degree was one of the main factors that I was hired out of all the competing candidates. I was promoted three times in two years and my background education was always a factor.

Upon returning back to Japan, I was offered opportunities to be part of the military community with my degree and research experience from SCSU.

There are other things in my life that have kept me out of academia and the workforce but my MS degree always provided me with a competitive resume and a strong candidate for hire and promotions.

I hope this helps in your decision to keep the MS degree at SCSU.

Thank you,

Thanh Ly-Turnbull
Good afternoon, Dr. Kenty-Drane,

I must admit that I have honestly mixed feelings about the possible elimination of the MS Sociology program. I think that if the program is to continue, there is a definitely room for improvement. Though I graduated in 2010, I still recall some particularly bad classes. Several of the online courses were very poorly designed. I also had one instructor for an online class who was not at all communicative, and actually asked me to not use outside sources so much to support my views (we obviously butted heads politically and I think this was her way of effectively shutting me up in the discussions). Dr. Bloch was adequate in person, but I found his online offerings to be severely lacking. My thesis adviser was so difficult to get in touch with that I ended up scrapping my thesis for a comp exam so I could graduate on time.

However, there were some great classes too. Dr. Emmelman's classes were excellent. I was saddened to hear of her passing. Likewise, I found Dr. Jackson to be an excellent professor as well. I felt that she held students to a higher standard than many of the other faculty. I didn't have a class with her until my final semester, at which point I felt a bit disillusioned with the program. I occasionally wondered how things might have been different if I had class with her sooner.

I think that maybe the program needs to focus on the skills relevant in today's market if it is going to survive. Students need to know that they will have the tools needed to succeed when the graduate (especially if they have student loans to pay off). I think that sociology can provide those skills. There is a huge push for data-driven decision making, and the federal government especially is hopping on the big data trend. By incorporating more statistics and data analysis into the program, students would have a better handle on the skills that today's employers are looking for. While having a quantitative methods class, and getting some experience with SPSS was great, I think that the program needs a stronger emphasis in that area. It would also be helpful to build up the classes on qualitative analysis. It would be great for students to get the hands on programs like NVivo, and have the opportunity to maybe code from a large sample data set. It may even be worthwhile for the MS program to include some basic computer science classes, or at the very least a computational social science class. These are skills and knowledge that would make the sociology MS program more relevant to today's job market and attract more students.

My goal leaving the MS program was to go on to my PhD in sociology, but that has obviously not happened. I don't think that the MS program served me well in that regard. As far as I know, none of the other ladies from my cohort have gone on to PhD programs either, though it was something we all had talked about doing (though they have made some cute babies!). I think that if you want the program to be able to prepare students for PhD programs that it would also need some retooling.

Currently I am a management analyst working on a contract at the US Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response in Washington, DC. While I don't think that my particular degree has necessarily been influential, having a masters degree in general has contributed to my success in a very competitive job market. I have built a solid foundation of strong writing and analytic skills through my education and experiences. Certainly the MS Sociology program contributed to that.
My apologies for writing such a novel, and in a slightly different direction than I think you were aiming for. Please feel free to contact me with any follow up questions.

Best regards,

Amber J. Michael
October 17, 2014

Dear Dr. Bergeron and Dr. Adams,

I am saddened to hear that the Masters of Science in Sociology program at Southern Connecticut State University is in jeopardy of being eliminated. I am writing today in support of the program, as it was the master’s program at SCSU that taught me the value of rigorous research and inspired me to pursue a career in academia. Most importantly, however, the program planted the seeds of my sociological imagination that, with cultivation, has become an integral part of who I am and how I approach the world.

It has been, it feels, quite a long time since I was a student at Southern. I am now in my seventh year of graduate studies at the University of Notre Dame and am in the process of completing my dissertation, which explores the processes and mechanisms that help to produce cohesion, commitment, trust, affective regard, and a sense of community within groups and organizations. Over the last several years I have had the opportunity to attend numerous conferences and workshops, work and publish with leading scholars in my field, and gain valuable teaching experience. In 2013 I was recognized by Notre Dame’s Graduate School as an outstanding graduate student teacher, and more recently I received the John J. Kane Award for Outstanding Graduate Student within the department of sociology.

During my tenure at Notre Dame, I’ve had many conversations about the state of academe, the value of pursuing a graduate degree in our present economy, and the utility of a terminal master’s degree in sociology. I often encounter the view that a terminal master’s degree in sociology is not practical as one from a more specialized field such as social work or criminal justice. I respectfully disagree. Sociology’s value lies in its breadth; its theories and methods allow us to consider important social issues from macro, meso, and micro vantage points. It highlights the importance of culture, structure, race, class, gender, and numerous other factors. Sociology challenges us to check our assumptions, and provides the ability to think critically, apply theory, and understand the foundations of good research. There are no more ‘transferable skills’ than these, and they should not be restricted to those enrolled in Ph.D. granting programs. The elimination of flexible, accessible master’s programs like Southern’s, however, may do just that.

Another valuable aspect of the M.S. in Sociology program at SCSU was the diversity I encountered in the classroom. My fellow students were employed as teachers, social workers, researchers, and religious leaders. Others were retirees fulfilling life goals. We ranged in age
from mid-twenties to early seventies, and our personal histories were equally as varied. This diversity resulted in a multitude of perspectives, and lead to some of the most interesting conversations about important social issues I have ever had. It was not just the material that required I examine my assumptions and think critically about the world- it was also my peers.

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the value of the faculty who construct relevant, interesting courses and generously give their time to mentor students. As the second in my family to earn a four year degree (my brother was the first), the academic system was a mystery to me. I had never considered a career as a professor or researcher, not because it seemed undesirable, but because I believed it was – financially speaking - unattainable. I had never heard of tuition waivers or stipends or fellowships. It was the encouragement of the faculty that lead me to submit and ultimately present my work at the Eastern Sociological Society’s Annual Meeting. And it was the faculty who explained how to find, evaluate, select, and apply to doctoral programs. They provided comments on my application materials and wrote letters of support. In short, I would not be where I am today without them, and for that I would like to express my gratitude. I hope that many more students are able to benefit from their knowledge and guidance as I have.

Sincerely,

M. Fletcher Pirkey
Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Sociology
University of Notre Dame
Dear Dr. Jackson,

I am writing this letter in support of the Southern Connecticut State University Sociology Graduate Program. I obtained my master degree from SCSU in May 2013. I was not certain after graduating with my bachelor degree if I wanted to continue my education. After obtaining my bachelor degree, I missed the classroom environment, demand of educational assignments, and exploring social issues with others. I chose Southern Connecticut State University due to its location, curriculum, several options for fulfilling the exit requirements of the degree, and the option of classes on line and meeting in the classroom.

Throughout my time in the program, I was challenged to broaden my understanding of social research and sociology. I found that my knowledge of how to perform valid research was vastly greater than peers in similar graduate programs. There were occasions that students from other fields such as women’s studies and social work would take sociology courses; throughout our classroom discussions, it became apparent that I had been provided a much better opportunity for formulating and executing research.

If this program were to make any changes, I would suggest providing a clearer curriculum than what is advertised. I entered the program hoping to focus on sociology and crime. I expected there to be many courses offered in this area as that is what was advertised in the graduate catalog. Unfortunately I was not able to take many of the courses listed due to staffing changes and/or low enrollment.

During my tenure at SCSU, I also participated in Graduate Sociology Club serving as secretary (2011-2012) and vice president (2012-2013). This afforded me the opportunity to meet with my peers as well as professors outside of the classroom and provided a lot of support through the stressful semesters. I continue to maintain a relationship with many of my peers as well as faculty from the program. I am very thankful for these relationships and connections as I navigate through my professional life.

Sincerely,

Victoria Soley, MS