

## ACADEMIC PRIORITIZATION OVERVIEW

Campus	Current State of Prioritization Process	Issues to Resolve	Next Steps	Lessons Learned
<b>MSU Bozeman</b>	Beginning	<p>Currently there are no outstanding issues to resolve.</p> <p>The review will identify pathways for continual improvement and success of doctoral programs, and will include a process for data-informed assessment and modification.</p>	<p>Select review team in Nov 2017. Identify methodologies for prioritization of doctoral programs in Dec 2017-Jan 2018. Establish the review process by Jan 2018. Begin monthly workshops with faculty and develop data sources and data formats in Feb 2018.</p>	<p>Process is in beginning phase.</p>
<b>UM Western</b>	Beginning	<p>Academic organizational structure must be reorganized. Current structure makes it difficult to consistently implement and sustain required program procedures.</p>	<p>Reorganization of academic affairs structure will be completed in FY18. Two Faculty Forums are scheduled (Nov 1 and Dec 13) to discuss annual criteria measurements.</p>	<p>The program review process needs to be standardized and done consistently by each department each year so that university resources can be aligned with program needs.</p>
<b>UM &amp; Missoula College</b>	In Progress	<p>It has been difficult to ensure the programmatic data are accurate. There were a few programs that did not submit reports, and we will review these based on available data.</p>	<p>APASP taskforce is conducting an initial prioritization and deans will respond to these recommendations. Authors can respond directly to the President and Cabinet. Implementation plans will be developed in Jan 2018.</p>	<p>Training for report authors and reviewers provides greater consistency. Electronic scoring software facilitates workflow. Program evaluations requires a balance of qualitative and quantitative metrics.</p>

## ACADEMIC PRIORITIZATION OVERVIEW

<b>Montana Tech</b>	In Progress	Initially the workgroup was parallel to the OCHE (Joe Thiel) process, and may be pressed to work faster to meet current and potential budget issues.	Workgroup will arrive at specific recommendations before the May BOR meeting. Program prioritization committee makeup will be decided mid spring semester.	Early engagement of faculty and staff is critical. There is concern that prioritization will be driven more by looming financial issues, rather than as an effort to improve the institution.
<b>Helena College</b>	Completed	How can we leverage guided pathways, community partnerships, and external funding sources to better inform prioritization and increase instructional and fiscal efficiency?	Investigate appropriate aspects of guided pathways model to improve instructional delivery and academic success.	It is easier for the committee to identify operational issues and inefficiencies and potential improvements than to rank programs. Need improved access to institutional data.
<b>MSU Northern</b>	Findings Implemented	Remaining programs that were placed into moratorium will be terminated.	Termination documentation will be submitted spring 2018.	Input from community and local school districts should have been included. Reinstated programs were a direct result of public reaction to the removal of secondary Ed programs.
<b>Great Falls College MSU</b>	Findings Implemented	Do we continue to review programs on regular cycle? Do we annually assess all program data snapshots? How do we follow up on improvement plans?	During the 2017-2018 academic year, the college will make a recommendation to College Planning Budget and Analysis Committee (CPBAC).	Strong institutional research personnel is critical. Stress reallocation of resources as the goal. Communication plan regarding final decisions is essential.

## ACADEMIC PRIORITIZATION OVERVIEW

<b>MSU Billings</b>	Findings Implemented	We needed a method to continually assess our programs.	We have developed a large data set that will monitor academic programs. Each program will report on the current “health” of the program.	The process helped spread the awareness of key metrics and data. There was not a plan to continue to work with the data and metrics to study academic programs – this plan now exists.
---------------------	----------------------	--	--	--

## ADMINISTRATIVE PRIORITIZATION OVERVIEW

Campus	Current State of Prioritization Process	Issues to Resolve	Next Steps	Lessons Learned
<b>University of Montana Western</b>	Beginning	Develop consistent documentation across departments.	Meetings are being held during the Fall 17 semester to discuss criteria. During Spring 18, departments will complete Departmental Program Review. During June and July, review and use data to plan for upcoming year.	No reportable lessons available at this stage.
<b>Montana Tech</b>	Beginning	Active and engaged WIRE group will be central to prioritization activities.	Similar to Academic Prioritization timeline.	Same lessons as Academic Prioritization process.
<b>MSU Northern</b>	Beginning	Need to determine administrative support areas to study and the metrics to be used for evaluation. Rubric and target goals must be established.	Working group will be established and meetings began by December 2017.	Same lessons as Academic Prioritization process.
<b>UM &amp; Missoula College</b>	In Progress	Fewer data are gathered for administrative services than for academic programs, so there is less information to analyze. There were a few services that did not submit reports.	APASP taskforce is conducting an initial prioritization and sector heads will respond to these recommendations. Authors can respond directly to the President and Cabinet.	Training for report authors and reviewers provides greater consistency. Electronic scoring software facilitates workflow.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PRIORITIZATION OVERVIEW

			Implementation plans will be developed in Jan 2018.	Program evaluations requires a balance of qualitative and quantitative metrics.
<b>MSU Bozeman</b>	In Progress	<p>Enable Deans and Department/Unit heads to make decisions by providing high-quality and timely data.</p> <p>Improve financial decision-making at the unit level.</p> <p>Enable units to focus on their primary mission.</p> <p>Improve employee expertise for higher compliance with policies and regulations.</p> <p>Improve employee job satisfaction.</p> <p>Address student enrollment growth.</p>	<p>Fiscal Services completed a pilot and is currently supporting 20 departments. Plans are to continue growth during FY'18 and re-engineer critical accounting processes.</p> <p>HR has implemented Phase I organizational changes; Phase II is now beginning.</p> <p>IT completed an assessment and has developed a new team-of-teams model. FY'18 will focus on implementing this new model.</p>	<p>Target areas with an obvious problem to solve. Ensure that solutions make identified processes easier and faster.</p> <p>Communicate with as many stake-holding groups as possible.</p> <p>Utilization of a networked (team-of-teams) approach is critical to input, idea generation and buy-in.</p> <p>Establish milestones and deadlines for specific short, medium and long-term goals.</p> <p>Employ metrics and data analytics from the outset.</p>
<b>Great Falls College MSU</b>	In Progress	<p>It was difficult to find qualitative and quantitative metrics that accurately compare disparate divisions.</p> <p>We need to establish measurable goals for administrative programs and compare divisions to themselves.</p>	<p>Develop an administrative program review process and get team in place to evaluate division reports by January 1, 2018.</p>	<p>Strong institutional research personnel is critical.</p> <p>Stress reallocation of resources as the goal.</p> <p>Communication plan regarding final decisions is essential.</p> <p>A neutral facilitation team must gather data and provides guidance.</p>

## ADMINISTRATIVE PRIORITIZATION OVERVIEW

<p><b>MSU Billings</b></p>	<p>In Progress and Completed</p> <p>In Progress:            - Student Affairs Divisional Administrative Program Review (5-year cycle)            -Disability Support Services            -Campus Store</p> <p>Completed:            -Student Health Services            -TRiO - Student Support Services</p>	<p>3 priority levels:            1. Mandatory and required services            2. Necessary and essential services for promotion of student success            3. Value-added, though not required, programs that educate the whole person</p>	<p>Administrative Services is working with all units of the MUS on a “Shared Services” Initiative. MSU Bozeman has been reviewing a set of offices/functions and has agreed to share best practices with MSUB.</p>	<p>Examining institutions that have attempted to prioritize all non-instructional programs across the campus, using an instrument that would produce ranking via a common measurement, is proving to be difficult. However, Division of Student Affairs moving forward in developing process.</p>
<p><b>Helena College</b></p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>Prioritization involves mainly qualitative criteria. Need to include relevant quantitative data.</p>	<p>Adopt appropriate aspects of guided pathways model that will improve delivery of student support services and student success outcomes.            Review data and engage in holistic inclusive discussion to implement comprehensive/strategic enrollment management plan.</p>	<p>It was easier for the committee to identify and discuss operational inefficiencies and improvements than to rank services. Some flexibility with interpreting results required to adapt to changing circumstances. Need to improve access to and proficiency with institutional data.</p>