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 Durnin
  - 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