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Criteria: Five criteria will be used to evaluate programs. The first four (relevance, quality, productivity, and efficiency) will be used for initial categorization. The fifth criterion (opportunity analysis) will be used to inform decisions on specific actions.

- Relevance: Alignment with university mission and strategic plan; essentiality to core functions of the university; demand for program or service; alignment of service with needs.
- Quality: Evidence of success in achieving goals; evidence of assessment and improvement; distinctiveness and reputational impact.
- Productivity: Output or production per investment of time or resources.
- Efficiency: Here defined to reflect the operational effectiveness of the program. For example, for an instructional program, a key component of efficiency is ability of students to progress in a timely manner.
- Opportunity Analysis: A description of enhancements that can be made to address unmet needs and/or better advance the goals of the university.

Weighting: The relative “weight” given to each of the criteria. Weightings are to-be-determined.

Data/Information Sources: Metrics in the tables that follow are in two categories corresponding to the source.

- “Data from IR” will be data provided, in easy to use format, by the Office of Institutional Research. The primary source of that data will be the Data Warehouse. Departments will be given the opportunity to verify that data.
- “Info from Dept” will be information provided by the department, and will consist of (i) qualitative and quantitative information in response to specific prompts (ii) additional information that the department regards relevant, and (iii) contextual information to help ensure that information provided by Institutional Research is interpreted correctly.

Key acronyms: IR: Office of Institutional Research; SCH: Student Credit Hours; FTE: Full time equivalent.
Scales of Analysis: Programs will be evaluated at three scales:
- Each emphasis or option, each minor, and each alternate degree (e.g., M.S. and M.Engr.)
- Each degree and certificate program (with all emphases, options, and alternate degrees consolidated within the appropriate degree program).
- Each academic department.

In the process of Program Prioritization, “Programs” should be defined in a way that facilitates the assessment and improvement of discrete university functions or activities. The three scales of analysis listed above are appropriate for academic departments. For each scale, deans will compare and make action-oriented decisions using a different set of metrics. There is substantial overlap in the functionality of those three scales; consequently, the analyses and subsequent actions will also overlap. In particular, degree/certificate program metrics roll up to constitute one of six components of department function. Those elements are: (i) offering of degree & certificate programs, (ii) other instructional activity, e.g., Disciplinary Lens courses and service courses for other departments, (iii) research and creative activity, (iv) service and community outreach, (v) advising and graduation success, and (vi) department administrative structure and support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degr/Cert program info from Dept:</td>
<td>Degr/Cert program info from Dept:</td>
<td>Degr/Cert program data from IR:</td>
<td>Degr/Cert program info from Dept:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Description of how the program meets needs of students, community, etc.</td>
<td>• Description of program distinctiveness and of impact on university reputation</td>
<td>• # of graduates per year</td>
<td>• Which courses required by the emphasis/minor are required by only that emphasis/minor? (Note #1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opportunity Analysis: What changes could be made to increase impact? Examples:
- Proposal to enhance, restructure, reduce, reorient, consolidate, reinvent, or phase out a program to produce more overall impact.
### Instructional Program Scale Metrics: Applied to each degree and certificate program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degr/Cert program data from IR:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Degr/Cert program data from IR:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Degr/Cert program data from IR:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Degr/Cert program data from IR:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• # of juniors and seniors as measure of student demand</td>
<td>• Graduating Student Survey (Note #6) dept-level results regarding: (i) preparation for employment &amp; continued education (Note #3) and (ii) contribution to civic engagement (Note #4)</td>
<td>• # of graduates per year</td>
<td>• Annual baccalaureate graduates per FTE of juniors + seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alumni survey (Note #2) dept-level results regarding: (i) preparation for employment &amp; continued education (Note #3) and (ii) contribution to civic engagement (Note #4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• As appropriate: self-support program performance information: $ per credit cost, total income, total expenses</td>
<td>• Average total credits at graduation for baccalaureate graduates (Note #10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degr/Cert program info from Dept:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Degr/Cert program info from Dept:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Degr/Cert program info from Dept:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Degr/Cert program info from Dept:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Context for # of majors if program is selective</td>
<td>• Evidence of student achievement of program learning goals</td>
<td>• Additional considerations &amp; context</td>
<td>• Additional considerations &amp; context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Description and evidence regarding contribution of program to university mission, core themes, and strategic plan (Note #5)</td>
<td>• Quality of program learning goal assessment structure and process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of changes made to meet needs of students, community, etc., e.g., relevance to national trends, use of advisory board, etc.</td>
<td>• Use of assessment results for curricular and pedagogical innovation and improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of success of and specific demand for graduates, as available, e.g., market data; community &amp; national demand; job placement rates; relevance of job to degree</td>
<td>• Description of program distinctiveness and of impact on university reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional considerations &amp; context (see note)</td>
<td>• Additional considerations &amp; context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Opportunity Analysis: What changes could be made to increase impact? Examples:

- Proposal to facilitate timely graduation of students, e.g., by streamlining curriculum, reducing bottlenecks, etc.
- Proposal to enhance quality and/or relevance and/or productivity and/or efficiency of program.
- Proposal to enhance, reduce, restructure, or phase out a program to produce more overall impact and/or to simplify student programmatic choices.
# Department Scale Metrics for Six Components

## Department Component 1: Rolled-up Metrics from Degree & Certificate Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Instructional Program Scale Metrics” (see above) rolled up from all degree &amp; certificate programs offered</td>
<td>“Instructional Program Scale Metrics” (see above) rolled up from all degree &amp; certificate programs offered</td>
<td>“Instructional Program Scale Metrics” (see above) rolled up from all degree &amp; certificate programs offered</td>
<td>“Instructional Program Scale Metrics” (see above) rolled up from all degree &amp; certificate programs offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Dept-level data from IR:</td>
<td>Additional Dept-level data from IR:</td>
<td>Additional Dept-level data from IR:</td>
<td>Additional Dept-level data from IR:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retention of juniors in the department’s programs (Note #12)</td>
<td>• Graduates per year per instructional cost (all sources)</td>
<td>• Graduates per year per faculty FTE</td>
<td>• Graduating Student Survey results re: (i) redundancy of courses (Note #14) and (ii) offering of courses at appropriate times (Note #15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information from Department</td>
<td>Information from Department</td>
<td>Information from Department</td>
<td>Information from Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional considerations &amp; context</td>
<td>• Additional considerations &amp; context</td>
<td>• Changes for greater productivity &amp; evidence of impact (Note #13)</td>
<td>• Changes for greater efficiency &amp; evidence of impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept Component 2: Instructional activity beyond Degree &amp; Cert Programs (e.g., DL, courses for other majors), &amp; total instructional activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data from IR:</td>
<td>Data from IR:</td>
<td>Data from IR:</td>
<td>Information from Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coursework demand for service courses: non-DL student credit hours (SCH) taken by students in other majors</td>
<td>• Undergrad teaching: proportion by full-time faculty as a % of peers (Delaware [Note #17] [Note #18])</td>
<td>• Student Credit Hours per instructional cost as a % of peers (Delaware [Note #19])</td>
<td>• Description of methods to assess need and to supply necessary capacity for non-majors courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demand for DL courses by students in other majors: SCH</td>
<td>Information from Department:</td>
<td>• Student Credit Hours per faculty (including adjunct) FTE (Note #20)</td>
<td>• Improvements/innovations, additional considerations,&amp; context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information from Department:</td>
<td>• Evidence of teaching effectiveness and commitment to teaching improvement</td>
<td>• Teaching load of tenured/tenure-track faculty relative to national peers (Delaware)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improvements/innovations, additional considerations,&amp; context</td>
<td>• Evidence of actions to improve non-degree instructional activity, for example, increased pass rates.</td>
<td>Information from Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Additional considerations &amp; context</td>
<td>Information from Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improvements/innovations, additional considerations,&amp; context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Department Component 3: Elements related to Research and Creative Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Information from Department:  
- Contribution of research & creative activity to University mission, core themes, and strategic plan  
- Relevance to national trends & initiatives  
- Strategic changes/improvements made re: departmental research/creative activity  
- Additional considerations & context | Information from Department:  
- Distinctiveness and impact on the University’s reputation of research & creative activity  
- Other indicators of quality, e.g., discussion and interpretation of listing of top journals and venues  
- Improvements/innovations, additional considerations, & context | Data from IR:  
- Research/creative activity per FTE  
- Research/creative activity per faculty FTE from Digital Measures report (Note #21)  
- Research $ per FTE relative to national peers (Delaware [Note #22]; as relevant)  
- Measure of interdepartmental collaborations in research and creative activity (Note #23) | Information from Department  
- Innovations/improvements to facilitate research/creative activity  
- Evidence of efficient use of resources, e.g., collaborations and shared access to equipment and facilities  
- Additional considerations & context |

### Department Component 4: Community Outreach and Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Information from Department:  
- Contribution of service/outreach to University mission, core themes, and strategic plan.  
- Description of five most impactful community partnerships (Note #24)  
- Description of five most impactful outreach/community service activities (Note #25)  
- Description of five most impactful University service contributions  
- Description of five most impactful professional service activities  
- Improvements/innovations, additional considerations, & context | Information from Department:  
- Distinctiveness and reputational impact of community partnerships and outreach  
- Evidence of actions to improve community outreach and service of the department  
- Additional considerations & context | Data from IR:  
- Community service per FTE from Digital Measures report  
- University service per FTE from Digital Measures report  
- Professional service per FTE from Digital Measures report | Information from Department:  
- Improvements/innovations, additional considerations, & context |

### Additional Considerations

- Improvements/innovations, additional considerations, & context
### Department Component 5: Elements related to advising, graduation success, alumni connection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Data from IR:  
- Graduating Student Survey results regarding advising effectiveness (Note #26) | Data from IR:  
- Graduating Student survey results regarding interactions with faculty members and peers (Note #27) | Data from IR:  
- Graduating Student survey results regarding frequency of meeting with an advisor (Note #28) | Data from IR:  
- Graduating student survey results regarding delay because of course availability (Note #29) |
| Information from Department  
- Evidence of engagement of students in discipline-related activities, e.g., internships, research/creative activity, employment, community activity, etc.  
- Improvements/innovations, additional considerations,& context | Information from Department  
- Evidence of value added of advising and student success actions  
- Evidence of actions to improve advising and other actions related to graduation success.  
- Additional considerations & context | Information from Department  
- Information on connection with alumni such as participation in advisory boards  
- Improvements/innovations, additional considerations,& context | Information from Department  
- Evidence of ease of accessibility of advising information, e.g., weblink, etc.  
- Improvements/innovations, additional considerations,& context |

### Department Component 6: Department Administrative Structure and Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Information from Department  
- Alignment of departmental administrative structure with needs of department, with description of improvements made.  
- Additional considerations & context | Information from Department  
- Regarding quality of service to students and to faculty/staff: what assessments are made and what innovations/improvements have been made to increase quality?  
- Customer satisfaction survey results as available  
- Additional considerations & context | Data from IR:  
- Admin support staff FTE per faculty (including adjunct) FTE, # of majors, # SCH, and # graduates  
- Innovations/improvements to increase productivity of administrative support and of department overall  
- Collaborations and innovations with other service centers and departments.  
- Additional considerations & context | Data from IR:  
- Cost of admin support staff per faculty FTE, #majors, SCH, & grads  
- Department operational budget (OE + travel) per faculty FTE |
| Data from IR:  
- Admin support staff FTE per faculty (including adjunct) FTE, # of majors, # SCH, and # graduates  
- Innovations/improvements to increase productivity of administrative support and of department overall  
- Collaborations and innovations with other service centers and departments.  
- Additional considerations & context | Data from IR:  
- Cost of admin support staff per faculty FTE, #majors, SCH, & grads  
- Department operational budget (OE + travel) per faculty FTE |
| Information from Department  
- Faculty FTE formally devoted to administrative work in department, per total faculty FTE (Note #31) | Information from Department  
- Faculty FTE formally devoted to administrative work in department, per total faculty FTE (Note #31) | Information from Department  
- Faculty FTE formally devoted to administrative work in department, per total faculty FTE (Note #31) | Information from Department  
- Faculty FTE formally devoted to administrative work in department, per total faculty FTE (Note #31) |
| Information from Department  
- Faculty FTE formally devoted to administrative work in department, per total faculty FTE (Note #31) | Information from Department  
- Faculty FTE formally devoted to administrative work in department, per total faculty FTE (Note #31) | Information from Department  
- Faculty FTE formally devoted to administrative work in department, per total faculty FTE (Note #31) | Information from Department  
- Faculty FTE formally devoted to administrative work in department, per total faculty FTE (Note #31) |
| Data from IR:  
- Faculty FTE formally devoted to administrative work in department, per total faculty FTE (Note #31) | Data from IR:  
- Faculty FTE formally devoted to administrative work in department, per total faculty FTE (Note #31) | Data from IR:  
- Faculty FTE formally devoted to administrative work in department, per total faculty FTE (Note #31) | Data from IR:  
- Faculty FTE formally devoted to administrative work in department, per total faculty FTE (Note #31) |
| Data from IR:  
- Faculty FTE formally devoted to administrative work in department, per total faculty FTE (Note #31) | Data from IR:  
- Faculty FTE formally devoted to administrative work in department, per total faculty FTE (Note #31) | Data from IR:  
- Faculty FTE formally devoted to administrative work in department, per total faculty FTE (Note #31) | Data from IR:  
- Faculty FTE formally devoted to administrative work in department, per total faculty FTE (Note #31) |
Opportunity Analysis: What changes could be made to increase impact?

Examples of potential items to include:

- Proposal to create a new transdisciplinary academic program.
- Identification of barriers to success (in all aspects of department function)
- As reasonable, proposals for solution to those barriers (including, as possible, budget-neutral solutions)
- Proposal for internal shift of resources to produce greater impact
- Proposal for department-level and/or broader scale reorganization/restructuring to increase university impact and/or efficiency.
- Proposal for increased impact with additional investment

Notes:

“Additional considerations & context” and “Improvements/innovations, additional considerations, & context” are prompts for the department to do three things:

- In those cells where information on innovations/improvements is not already sought, the department may describe any key innovations and improvements made that are relevant to that cell (e.g., describe innovations/improvements in the cell focused on relevance of research/creative activity).
- The department should provide context for data provided by Institutional Research so as to prevent misinterpretation of the data by individuals unfamiliar with the context of the department. A very simple example would be to note that a paucity of graduates is the result of the newness of a program.
- It is impossible to list in this document every possible type of evidence a department might bring to bear regarding its relevance, quality, productivity, and efficiency. Departments are encouraged to provide additional evidence such as surveys conducted by the department, benchmark data specific to the discipline, information from professional accreditation reviews, and description of impacts on particular student populations (e.g., underrepresented groups), etc.

Note 1: If there are courses that are required only by a particular emphasis/minor, then a department typically must continue to offer those courses if it continues to offer the emphasis/minor. This information will be relevant if there are few graduates from that emphasis/minor and if enrollments in those courses are overly small.

Note 2: The alumni survey has been offered for decades. For the last two administrations of the alumni survey, the response rates have been: 2007-2008 graduates administered in 2009-10 - 42%; 2009-2010 graduates administered in 2011-12 - 54%. The survey is administered every other year to graduates who are one year out. The 2013-14 survey of 2011-12 graduates was sent out in early October, 2013, and results will be available to be used in the process. Graduate students and undergraduates will be reported separately. Results of the survey will only be used when there are sufficient responses to provide relatively reliable information.

Note 3: Responses to the following questions: i) “How well did BSU prepare you for your current employment?” ii) “How well did BSU prepare you for graduate/professional school?” iii) “How often are you using knowledge and skills acquired at BSU in your job?”

Note 4: Responses to the following: “How much did your major/academic department contribute to your current level of engagement in in the following:” “community service or volunteer work;” “involvement in community or civic organizations, church activities, etc.;” “voting in local, state, or
national elections;” and “attending arts and cultural events.” Four answers varying from “extensively” to “little or none.” Note that this question was added for the Fall 2013 Alumni Survey only, and so sample sizes may be lower than for other questions.

Note 5: at: The University’s Strategic Plan, Focus on Effectiveness, can be found at http://academics.boisestate.edu/provost/goals-and-strategies/ The University’s mission can be found http://academics.boisestate.edu/strategic-plan/mission/, and our Core Themes can be found at http://academics.boisestate.edu/strategic-plan/core-themes/ with additional detail on core objectives and indicators at (http://academics.boisestate.edu/planning/accreditation-standard-one/).

Note 6: The graduating student survey has been conducted since 1996; the response rates from the last three administrations of the survey are as follows: Fall 10 - SP 11, 52%; Fall 11- SP 12, 42%; Fall 12-SP 13, 39%. Three years of data will be combined to give better sample sizes. Graduate students and undergraduates will be reported separately. Results of the survey will only be used when there are sufficient responses to provide relatively reliable information.

Note 7: Responses to the following questions: i) “How well did BSU prepare you for your current employment?” ii) “How well did BSU prepare you for graduate/professional school?” iii) “How often are you using knowledge and skills acquired at BSU in your job?”

Note 8: Responses to the following two statements: i) “Faculty were outstanding teachers”; ii) “Faculty members were genuinely interested in the welfare of the students.”

Note 9: Responses to the following questions: i) “If you could start over again would you choose the same major at Boise State?” ii) “Would you recommend to current students that they select your major program at Boise State?”

Note 10: Analysis will be limited to students graduating with a single degree/single major and focused on native students (i.e., those that did not transfer).

Note 11: The reason that the attrition and time to degree measure are focused on doctoral programs is that many of our master’s programs are professional programs, such as the MBA, which serve a population that includes many part-time students. Attrition and time to degree are not good measures of programs with substantial numbers of part-time students.

Note 12: Measured as proportion of juniors enrolled in a major at 10th day fall semester who re-enroll the following fall in a major in the same department.

Note 13: Departments have the opportunity to describe innovations/improvements made to increase the productivity/efficiency of their offering of degree programs, and to provide evidence of the success of those efforts. Three potential examples: (i) streamlining of the curriculum to enable student to progress in a timely fashion, thereby reducing the number of credits at graduation and the rate of graduation of those students, (ii) reducing the number of very low enrollment “boutique” classes offered for the major, thereby increasing the efficient use of faculty FTE and increasing the per-FTE number of credits offered and number of graduates, (iii) streamlining the curriculum, while maintaining quality of the program, to enable a department to devote additional FTE to research. Note that innovations/improvements regarding quality and relevance were asked about at the degree/certificate program level.

Note 14: Responses regarding the following statement: “A number of courses covered the same material and were redundant.”
Note 15: Responses regarding the following statement: “Many department courses were not offered at the right time for me.”

Note 16: This measure will quantify the offering, by a department, of courses that are so small that they require an inordinate investment of faculty time for the instructional value of the course. An analogous situation is the use by Extended Studies of enrollment thresholds below which a class does not “make” because there is not enough income from the course to justify its offering. In the case of program prioritization, the thresholds will be lower and will focus on lecture and lab courses, and will exclude classes focused on individual students (e.g., directed research, independent study, private lessons, etc.). The specific thresholds are yet to be developed; the undergraduate threshold will be higher than the graduate threshold.

Note 17: “The Delaware Study” is the informal title of the “National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity,” which is administered by the University of Delaware. Additional information can be found at http://www.udel.edu/IR/cost/brochure.html. The study provides national benchmark information on four aspects of department function: teaching loads of tenured/tenure track faculty members, proportion of undergraduate teaching carried out by regular faculty members, cost per credit hour, and externally funded research per faculty member. Departments will be provided with the raw data used to produce the ratios for their departments so that the data may be verified.

Note 18: Undergraduate teaching proportion by full time faculty members is calculated as the percent of total undergraduate credit hours that are taught by full time faculty members. “… as a percent of peer” is then calculated. Note that the peer group is not Boise State’s SBOE approved peer group, but is instead the set of all public universities that are classified as “research” (which includes the Carnegie Basic classifications at the doctoral level) or “comprehensive” (which includes the Carnegie Basic classifications at the master’s level).

Note 19: Initial ratio is calculated as total student credit hours at all levels per budgeted costs (including local and appropriated funds) of the instructional personnel who offered those credit hours. The ratio is then compared to peer data at the level that best matches the department: “Research” for departments that offer doctoral degrees and “Comprehensive” for those departments that do not offer doctoral degrees. “Cost of instruction as a percent of peer” is then calculated. Note that the peer group is not Boise State’s SBOE approved peer group, but is instead the set of all public universities that are classified as “research” (which includes the Carnegie Basic classifications at the doctoral level) or “comprehensive” (which includes the Carnegie Basic classifications at the master’s level).

Note 20: Includes credits taught by a department’s faculty member in courses not offered by the department, e.g., University Foundation courses, cross-listed courses, and college-level courses (e.g., MBA or ENGR).

Note 21: Digital Measures reports will quantify numbers of peer-reviewed publications, other publications, exhibitions, performances, etc. For artistic performances, exhibitions, etc., the level of the venue can be used to give an approximation of quality and impact, and the same applies to presentations at conferences. For publications, the options are more limited. Peer-reviewed vs. not peer-reviewed is one way to determine quality/impact. However, Digital Measures does not include such quantifications as impact factor. Department Chairs will have the opportunity to identify research/creative activity of high impact/quality.
Note 22: The initial ratio is calculated as research expenditures per tenured/tenure track faculty FTE. The ratio is then compared to peer data at the level that best matches the department: “Research” for departments that offer doctoral degrees and “Comprehensive” for those departments that do not offer doctoral degrees. “Cost of instruction as a percent of peer” is then calculated. Note that the peer group is not Boise State’s SBOE approved peer group, but is instead the set of all public universities that are classified as “research” (which includes the Carnegie Basic classifications at the doctoral level) or “comprehensive” (which includes the Carnegie Basic classifications at the master’s level). Note that this ratio is only calculated for those departments for which the appropriate peer ratio is greater than $0 per faculty member.

Note 23: This measure will compensate, to a certain extent, for the fact that another metric, research expenditures, is assigned to the department of the Principal Investigator, with the result that if a Co-Principal Investigator is in a different department, the Co-PI’s department would receive no credit for that grant. The “collaboration” measure will consist the percentage of a department’s grants that involve collaboration with PIs or Co-PIs in other departments.

Note 24: A community partnership can be contrasted with community outreach (see next note), and focuses on collaboration that results in benefits to both the community and the campus. The definition of community partnerships as used by the Carnegie Foundation is “collaborative interactions with community and related scholarship for the mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, information, and resources”

Note 25: Community outreach can be contrasted with community partnership (see previous note), and consists of the university providing some sort of resource or service to the community. The definition as used by the Carnegie Foundation is “the application and provision of institutional resources for community use with benefits to both campus and community.”

Note 26: Responses to the following statements: “I received sound academic advice;” “My advisor: Is a helpful, effective advisor whom I would recommend to other students.”

Note 27: Responses to the following statements: “There was good communication between faculty and students regarding student needs/concerns”; ii) “Many opportunities existed outside of class for interactions between students and faculty”; iii) “The interactions and discussions with my peers in the department were a major source of motivation and support.”

Note 28: Responses to the following question: “While a student at Boise State University, did you meet with an advisor at least every year?”

Note 29: Responses to the following statement: “I had to delay graduation because of course availability.”

Note 30: Analysis will be limited to students graduating with a single degree/single major. Average credits at graduation will be analyzed in two ways: (i) The average credits at graduation will be calculated for students who began at Boise State (i.e., “native” students). This will provide a relative measure of how easily a student can progress to a degree here. (ii) The differential between native students and transfer students in number of credits at graduation will be calculated. This will provide a relative measure of the difficulty a student has in transferring credits for the major.

Note 31: Includes only the faculty FTE devoted to those administrative functions for which release time is granted.