



OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND VICE-PRESIDENT (ACADEMIC)

2 October 2013

Members of Senate
University of Guelph

Dear Members of Senate:

Attached is the completed report from the Program Prioritization Process (PPP) Task Force. This is an important milestone for the University, and represents a great deal of hard work by the Task Force and everyone who contributed to the process. It will be a critical tool for extracting opportunities from the challenges we face now, and over the next decade.

The PPP is a new addition to the assessment component of the University's Integrated Planning process, which has already helped us make tough choices in a transparent, rational, and I would argue forwardly-successful manner. We make those choices in an environment in which it is clear that governments will no longer fund institutions in the same way. We must identify areas of strength in our programs and services and ensure they are well supported in order to best use the limited funds that are available. Faced with government requirements to do more with less, we must do better what we do well, and leave to others what we cannot sustain at a level of quality we can be proud to associate with the Guelph name.

The decisions we need to make--and they will at times be difficult decisions--must be evidence-based, because we cannot afford to rely on entrenched practices or assumptions. They must be transparent so that there is no resentment, even if there is some regret. They must balance the need to cut where sustainability is at risk with the opportunity to invest strategically for future success. And they must be made by us--the University of Guelph community, because we can't trust or defer to others decisions that need to protect and promote our interests. It is up to us to preserve what is best about Guelph, as one of the universities that will emerge from the next decade stronger, better, and more empowered to pursue our mission.



It is important to know that the PPP ranking is not the sole determinant of decisions regarding a program or service. The rankings in this report, in conjunction with other IP-based metrics, were used to set initial unit budget targets to help address the immediate and significant challenge: a projected funding gap of \$32.4 million over the next three fiscal years. In addition, the PPP report will be a key tool to assist deans, chairs, directors, and managers in developing their budget plans. As always, any decisions arising from the implementation of those plans will go through the University's normal governance processes that end with the Board of Governors and Senate.

I encourage each of you to read the report, as we will need the informed input and participation of the entire campus community as we work to find solutions to the problem we face. I would like to thank everyone involved for their hard work, dedication, and commitment.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Ma Mancuso', with a stylized, cursive script.

Maureen Mancuso
Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

University of Guelph

PPP

***Program Prioritization Process
Task Force
Report***

***J. Alan Sullivan
Michelle Fach
PPP Task Force***

September 9, 2013

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	4
2. Introduction	6
3. The Process.....	6
3.1 Mandate and Support.....	6
3.2 The Template (PIR-From)	6
3.3 Criteria/Rubric.....	7
3.4 The Task Force	7
3.5 Task Force Terms of Reference	7
3.6 Task Force Training	8
3.7 Technology	8
3.8 Norming.....	8
3.9 Ranking, Scoring.....	9
3.10 Author Experiences	10
4. The Observations and Recommendations on the Process	10
4.1 Completing the Forms.....	10
4.2 Data.....	11
4.3 The Criteria, Scoring and Type of Program.....	12
4.4 Service Teaching;	12
5. Conclusions on the Process:.....	13
6. Rankings	13
7. Observations and Recommendations.....	13
7.1 Policy Areas.....	14
7.1.1 Distribution of Effort (DOE)	14
7.1.2 Instructional Programs: Graduate	14
7.1.3 Instructional Programs: Undergraduate	18
7.1.3 International Development (IDEV).....	20
7.1.4 Research Programs	21
7.1.5 Physical Space	22
7.2 Opportunities and Efficiencies.....	23
7.2.1 Revenue Generation	23
7.2.2 Evaluation of Ancillary Operations.....	24
7.2.3 Curriculum Changes	24

7.2.4 Restructuring	26
7.2.5 Distance Education	28
7.2.6 Administrative Functions	28
Centralization.....	28
8. Appendix A: PIR-Form.....	31
9. Appendix B: Rubric.....	53
10. Appendix C: Task Force Terms of Reference	58
11. Appendix D: Rankings.....	64

1. Executive Summary

The Program Prioritization Process (PPP) was initiated to assess all MTCU and ancillary-funded programs at the University. A major objective of the PPP was to provide an additional assessment tool to help inform the allocation of unit budget reduction targets in the context of the University's second Integrated Plan. In that plan, an initial target of \$32 million was set to ensure the University maintained a balanced structural budget by the end of the Plan (2016/2017). The primary goal in assigning targets was to allocate limited financial resources to those programs and services that would continue to build on both the University's core strengths and meet the major goals set under its Integrated Plan.

University departments prepared 492 PIR (Program Information Requests) forms over a five month period (November 2012-March 2013). On March 25, 2013 a Task Force, composed of 21 individuals including faculty, staff and students representing various colleges and units received all of the PIR-Forms along with a commentary provided by the Deans and Division heads responsible for their respective programs. Over next the 13 week period, the Task Force reviewed and ranked all programs and made a number of recommendations related to both the process and the outcomes of their reviews. The programs were evaluated within 10 criteria using a rubric that allowed for one of three scoring options: below expectations, meets expectations or exceeds expectations. The Task Force, where possible, also used additional data e.g., "Delaware" data as comparator costing information related to instructional programs in academic departments.

While the ranking of the programs into 5 quintiles (of an equal number of programs) was a major component of the final report, the Task Force also made a number of observations and recommendations which were grouped into two broad areas namely Policy (current policies that should be reviewed) and Opportunities and Efficiencies. Observations included:

- Minors and other low enrolment programs generally scored poorly during the review due to a number of factors such as costing issues and inability to demonstrate demand.
- Major programs were highly variable in scoring. Generally the smaller programs had low scores due to low or declining enrolments.
- Some overspecialization was observed in undergraduate and graduate programs which resulted in smaller and weaker programs.
- The current normal faculty Distribution of Effort (DOE) appeared to limit opportunities for improving resource allocations.
- High concentration in certain programs of Sessional Instructors and Post-Doctoral Fellows in delivery of graduate programs.

Several recommendations were made which included:

- A review of the current DOE in order to find additional teaching resources from the research and service components of the standard DOE (40/40/20).

- Specific to graduate programs, the Task Force recommended that departments adopt a more balanced approach to the use of Sessional and Post-docs and University wide efforts be made to develop more competitive methods to attract more graduate students.
- Related to undergraduate programs, the Task Force recommended that smaller programs be reviewed in the context of their sustainability and that the necessity for the appointment of sessional instructors in certain programs be examined relative to both faculty DOE and for impact on the program delivery.

Within Opportunities and Efficiencies, several observations and recommendations were made that included;

- Opportunities for restructuring, streamlining, centralization and improved accountability.
- Opportunities to generate greater revenue with non-degree courses and programs.
- Assisting ancillary operations to establish revenue targets which will benefit their overall performance and accountability.
- Opportunities for partnership, collaboration and restructuring were identified in order to address certain low enrolment programs.
- Additional savings realized through the centralization of institutional services.
- Opportunities to enhance the University's current strategic priorities such as Internationalism and Open Learning were also highlighted.

In conclusion, the Task Force is confident in the results of this process and supports its findings. The results should be used in conjunction with the Integrated Plan to inform decisions and serve as a catalyst for meaningful change.

2. Introduction

The landscape of higher education is changing. Institutions are facing demands for increased accountability regarding quality and student outcomes. Financial resources are strained as costs continue to rise while revenues remain flat. Student recruitment has become more challenging with increased competition and shifting demographics.

The University of Guelph is facing a new \$32 M structural budget deficit on the heels of a major \$46 M budget reduction essentially completed in 2013. Given the labor-intensive nature of University operations, there is no doubt that these necessary budget reductions will mean a reduced workforce, more efficient services and fewer programs. Institutions no longer have the luxury of being everything to everyone. It is time to prioritize and invest in the future. The Program Prioritization Process is a tool that will be used in conjunction with Integrated Planning to inform budget reductions and decisions on future priorities and directions.

The Program Prioritization Process (PPP) began in Fall 2012 with the PPP Project Team consisting of members of Senior Administration. The purpose of this project team was to provide overall guidance and direction to the Task Force in the evaluation of all instructional and non-instructional programs.

3. The Process

3.1 Mandate and Support

The Program Prioritization Process was established to assess all MTCU and ancillary-funded programs at the University of Guelph and to prioritize programs so that limited resources could be allocated to build on the University's strength's while meeting budgetary reductions. Programs were grouped into two major categories; instructional programs which included degree-credit programs and all other (non-instructional) programs which included activities in academic and non-academic units. A Task Force of 21 University community members was appointed by the President to review and rank all programs within 5 quintiles of an equal number of programs. Support for this effort was provided by a University Project Team and external consultants from Academic Strategy Partners Inc. (ASP).

3.2 The Template (PIR-Form)

The Program Information Request (PIR) Form used to capture program information on programs was developed by the University based on other institutions experience with the process. Ten criteria were chosen as important indicators of a program's overall impact and essentiality. The PIR Form (Appendix A) and the same criteria were used to evaluate both Instructional (defined as University degree-credit programs) and Non-instructional programs.

3.3 Criteria/Rubric

There were 10 criteria used to evaluate instructional and non-instructional programs. These criteria and associated rubric were developed by the Project Team and can be found in Appendix B.

3.4 The Task Force

The Task Force comprised 21 members including a Chair and Vice-Chair was created to review and rank all of the program submissions. The membership was distributed as follows:

- 7 current chairs of Senate Standing Committees
- 2 Past Chairs of Senate Standing Committees
- 5 Staff members – nominated by the University Community
- 5 faculty – nominated by the University Community
- 2 students – application for internship positions

The Senate Bylaws and Membership committee reviewed and recommended all nominees and the slate was presented to the President, who accepted the membership without change.

The members of the Task Force were as follows:

Faculty: Profs. Wayne Caldwell, Ontario Agricultural College (OAC); Darren Wood, Ontario Veterinary College (OVC); Jonathan Newman, (OAC); Bill Van Heyst, College of Physical and Engineering Science (CPES); and Steven Newmaster, College of Biological Science (CBS).

Staff: Cara Wehkamp, Student Life; Heidi Huisman, CME; Steve Seifried, CPES; Michelle Fach, Open Learning and Educational Support; and Dan MacLachlan, Physical Resources.

Students: Noorain Shethwala, undergraduate, Criminal Justice and Public Policy, and OAC graduate student Anne Laarman.

Faculty and current and past chairs of Senate standing committees: Profs. Coral Murrant (CBS), Planning and Priorities; Ian Newby-Clark (CSAHS), Quality Assurance; Scott McEwen (OVC), Graduate Studies; Kerry Godfrey (CME), BUGS; Alison Duncan (CBS), Non-Degree Studies; Catherine Carstairs (COA), Bylaws; Ann Wilson (COA), Research Board; Paul Salmon (COA), past chair of Non-Degree Studies, and Al Sullivan (OAC), past chair of Planning and Priorities.

Prof. Al Sullivan was Chair and Michelle Fach was Vice Chair.

3.5 Task Force Terms of Reference

In order to ensure a common understanding and agreement of the functioning of the Task Force, Terms of Reference were drafted (Appendix C). The content included input from all Task Force members and the final document was unanimously supported.

3.6 Task Force Training

Support to the Task Force was provided by ASP consultants. In Fall 2012, the consultants met with the Task Force Chairs to provide an overview of the process, to respond to questions and to discuss next steps. In addition, the consultants met with unit leaders and individuals who had responsibility for authoring the PIR forms to provide context around the expectations, to explain the criteria and to answer questions.

In March 2013, the consultants led a 2-day orientation session for all Task Force members. The outcomes of the session included:

- An understanding of the rationale, deliverables and work to date;
- Development and agreement of meeting norms, roles and accountabilities;
- An understanding of the system, tools, scoring, rating, ranking and rubric;
- Task force norming on the 10 criteria to be used in the evaluation of programs.

Overall, the session was successful and allowed the Task Force to effectively move forward in an informed manner with a consistent framework. However, the session also highlighted that the Task Force was lacking data to effectively evaluate Criterion 7 (Revenue) and Criterion 8 (Expenses). As well, the orientation session confirmed that additional task force norming was required on Criterion 10 (Opportunities) to ensure consistency in the evaluation. As a result of this, the Task Force Chairs requested additional data and support for these activities and an additional meeting was held that included presentations from the Assistant Vice President (Finance and Services) and Institutional Analysis and Planning.

3.7 Technology

Personnel from CCS, Kent Hoeg, Jim Burgess and Steve Maxwell (Independent Consultant) created a relational data base that greatly facilitated the work of the Task Force. This was a user friendly system that allowed Task Force members to achieve a high level of competence and comfort very quickly. The program allowed the following operations:

- input of scores by individual members
- viewing of all scores by a group
- ability to correct scores and add comments
- ability to sign-off on the scores and 'lock' the scores to prevent tampering
- single step to rank all programs, break ties and produce quintiles
- ability to move programs between quintiles and add a new set of comments
- numerous sorting and filtering features to facilitate general and specific report preparation

3.8 Norming

The Task Force agreed to build in a mechanism to ensure that the scoring from week to week and from group to group was consistent. In order to accomplish this, the four groups scored a common PIR Form for each of the first six weeks of their review process. The six PIR Forms were chosen to reflect a cross section of the submissions including undergraduate majors and minors, graduate programs and non-instructional programs. This was a very important exercise and Task Force believed it would lend a high level of confidence and credibility to the results.

Although there was some variability in the individual scores for each criterion, the group scores were remarkably similar. Where variation did occur, the scores were close to the

borderline between 'meets' and 'below expectation' outcomes. Given the small difference in the weighting values (e.g., 1 vs 3), this had a minimal impact on the weighted score and placement in a quintile. The scoring was conducted in that same manner from group to group and from week to week. As further evidence of scoring consensus, at the completion of the scoring process, the distribution of all programs by group and quintile also indicated that there was a high degree of consistency among groups.

3.9 Ranking, Scoring

The process for evaluating programs was approached in a comprehensive and consistent manner. The 21 members of the Task Force were divided into 4 groups that included representation of colleges, faculty, staff and students. The 492 programs were randomly distributed to each group, taking into account any conflicts of interest identified by the Task Force members.

Over a period of 13 weeks, members reviewed the assigned programs (approximately 15 per week) prior to each group meeting and individually ranked the programs across the 10 criteria. Individual scores were recorded in the PPP database system. The scoring system utilized was based on the maximum score available for each criterion. For example, "history" of a program (Criterion 1) had 5 points and the score assigned by the Task Force member was therefore out of 5. The rubric that was made available to authors of the PIR forms was used by the Task Force to assist in the assessment of the criteria.

The groups then collectively discussed any variability in their scores and came to a consensus on the final score. The rubric served to convert the final score to one of three ratings:

1. Below Expectations
2. Meets Expectations
3. Exceeds Expectations

The group recorded their final rating and provided overall comments to support their findings. Once the group confirmed their ratings and provided comments, the consolidated group scores and ratings were locked into the system.

Once the groups reviewed all assigned programs, a second validation exercise was conducted. Each group was provided with a list of their assigned programs and ranked by their total scores. The total score was a calculation of the weight of the criterion multiplied by 1 (below expectation), 3 (meets expectation), or 9 (exceeds expectation). The maximum score available for any program was 900. The results were reviewed and discussed by the groups to ensure consistency and reasonability of results.

A second level of ranking was built into the computer program that allowed for breaking of ties. The second level was based on scores generated for the most important and highest scoring criteria (i.e. 5, 6 and 9) which were valued at 12 or 15 points. This sorted programs with the same total scores into a descending order.

Once all groups were satisfied with their programs scores, the entire set of programs was placed into quintiles which locked the scores and placement of programs. As a Task Force, the overall ranking and placement into quintiles were reviewed for completeness and consistency. Some programs with the same scores around the break points between

quintiles were moved. This resulted in a slight imbalance among quintiles but was deemed necessary for consistency and fairness.

3.10 Author Experiences

In total, 152 authors had the responsibility of writing 492 PIR forms. The process also included a written context piece provided by 22 submitters. Several Authors were also members of the Task Force. One of the consistent themes that arose from discussions with these individuals was challenges with availability, presentation and interpretation of the certain data.

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that the Project Team debriefs with all Authors and Submitters to gain additional insight into the experiences and to inform future prioritization exercises.

4. The Observations and Recommendations on the Process

The following sections include general observations about the process with specific focus on suggestions for future PPP's. It is hoped that they will help explain, in a general way, why some programs scored better than others and that this information will inform similar exercises in the future.

4.1 Completing the Forms

Some PIR-Forms were not well prepared and as a consequence it is possible that certain programs were not as well represented as they could have been. This was reflected in the rankings as the Task Force had to focus its evaluation almost entirely on the PIRForms submitted. Some specific examples of different observations in this regard include;

- Copying and pasting information from one form to another was common, and understandable. However, sometimes the information was not relevant to the specific program (e.g., major information on a minor program form).
- In some cases authors did not directly answer the questions associated with the various criteria and in other examples, authors provided long statements, frequently containing largely irrelevant or redundant information when shorter and more direct answers would have been more effective.
- Where programs covered multiple activities, authors did not always do a good job of discussing each activity under each criterion. This made it difficult for the Task Force to score the whole program. For instance, some programs provided multiple levels/types of activities. Each activity needed to be discussed across all criteria. Where there were connections among program components, sometimes these were mentioned, other times not. Inter-relationships between elements, both horizontally and vertically, tended to be ill-defined or unexplained.
- Some forms contained language that was overly specific to a program or unclear terminology and assumed that the reader had a level of understanding/insight about the program that was unreasonable. This made it difficult for the Task Force to appreciate the qualities of the program. The authors may know that their program is very strong, but they needed to imagine trying to convince a reader, who is not familiar with their program, why the program is strong.

- Data were available, and reported in a variety of formats. In and of itself this wasn't necessarily a problem. The problem arose when authors weren't clear on the units of measure being reported. For example, faculty numbers versus faculty FTEs, or student numbers versus student enrolments. As well, authors used language such as 'many' or percentages to describe quantity which was not helpful.
- Surprisingly few authors made use of graphs or tables even though the software provided for this ability. Among those programs that did provide graphs or figures, these elements were not always properly labeled or explained (e.g. no figure legends, no axis labels or units, etc.).
- It was important to read the description of each criterion carefully and provide information that answers the specific question(s). It was surprising how often basic information was not provided or was not detailed enough to properly assess the program. For some criteria, the questions may need to be modified or clarified to assist better interpretation by authors. For example, it would also be helpful to the Task Force members if, at the beginning of the form, there were specific instructions to provide a description of the program.

4.2 Data

The following are a number of observations and recommendations regarding opportunities to improve future PPP's and the development and improvement of supporting data;

- In general, programs had difficulty putting together compelling evidence benchmarking their indicators of demand, size, quality and costs. For undergraduate programs, the Task Force made reference to the Delaware Data for Criterion 8 (Expenses), but no such benchmarks were available for graduate programs or non-instructional programs, *in many cases*. The Delaware Data did not always map directly on to programs and certain authors may not have used it as effectively as they could have. This was unfortunate because some programs may have specific expenses such as field trips, intensive labs or work with live animals that were not explained in the program cost data.
- In many cases, particularly for instructional programs, authors had the opportunity to provide benchmark comparisons, by extracting them from the centrally available PPP data. Very few authors availed themselves of this opportunity. That said, the centrally available PPP data could have been made more accessible to the Task Force and perhaps to some extent pre-populated in the PIR-Forms rather than centralized PDFs. In trying to construct appropriate benchmarks, it took reviewers a great deal of effort to extract the necessary information from these documents.
- One feature that tended to separate high and low scoring programs was the use of evidence to support claims. In cases where data were not available centrally, programs that scored well tended to be those that gathered the necessary data themselves, *as best they could*, rather than simply reporting that they had no data.
- Departments that were required to submit forms for fairly new programs were challenged in finding sufficient evidence to support the quality outcomes and the demand for the program. This affected their scoring and final ranking.

Recommendation: To the degree that this is possible, it would benefit all departments, schools and the Task Force to have clearly defined and comparable

data comparing individual programs. This includes clear and comparable data for costing and demand.

- It was noted that in some cases the cost of sessionals was not included or captured in the total FTE costs for the program. This may have been because sessional costs are not part of a department base budget and did not recognize sessional costs as part of their “costing exercise” for instructional programs.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the actual costs of sessionals be clearly included in the costing information in future prioritization exercises.

- A very common phrase on the PIR forms was “we operate within budget” but there was no evidence provided to confirm this. For example if a department were to have difficulty meeting their budget reductions there was no required data (provided on the PIR-Form) to disclose this fact.

Recommendation: It was observed that costing and revenue information was mainly based on base budget data. This made the evaluation of how departments were doing against actual results difficult. It is suggested that actual results for a past period (compared to budget) be included in future PPP’s .

4.3 The Criteria, Scoring and Type of Program

The evaluation of all types of programs e.g., Instructional and Non-instructional Programs using the same template and criteria presented some variability in the scoring. While this was predicted and a deliberate decision of the Project Team, the Task Force noted that some types of programs had different scoring potential in some criteria compared to other types of programs. This meant that in certain types of programs there were some criteria that scored lower or higher relative to others of different types. For example, there were differences in the type of financial and demand data available for Instructional and Non-instructional Programs including budget and benchmarking data. Also some service programs with a high level of centrality, scored well due to the essentiality of the service.

Recommendation: While the Task Force believes that using the same template did not seriously affect the ranking outcomes among programs types, for future PPP’s, consideration should be given to using different sets of criteria. One potential direction could be the separation of instructional and non-instructional programs/services.

4.4 Service Teaching;

Service teaching did not have consistent disclosure in the PIR-Forms. Some programs differentiated the service teaching that was overlapping with the supported program, compared with ‘pure service’ teaching. An example of pure service teaching would be MATH*1030 Business Mathematics. This course does not service any of the major or minor programs offered by the Math & Stats Department, yet it serves an important role in the university. This sort of ‘pure service’ was not properly captured by this Process and, as a result, was under-valued. There are examples of Departments where service teaching was by far their greatest effort with very little demand for their major(s). The observation of the Task Force was that the inclusion of Service Teaching under some majors with very low

enrolment distorted both the strength of the service teaching role and the weakness of the associated major.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the costs and value of Service Teaching be captured as a separate program in future prioritization exercises.

5. Conclusions on the Process:

This report and its rankings are the result of an exhaustive amount of effort on the part of the authors, submitters and Task Force members. All members of the Task Force are confident in the process and results given the breadth of the participation by the University community and the diversity of Task Force membership. With the extensive norming and review processes instituted, the rankings show that there is a great deal of diversity among programs, particularly instructional versus non-instructional. The process identified areas of strengths and weaknesses and areas that are candidates for further consideration for investment, reinvestment or divestment as well as areas that have revenue growth capability.

While the process provided the Task Force with a broad view of the institutional landscape that identified trends and potential opportunities, any specific decisions on changes related to major restructuring were outside the scope of this process. Some recommendations appear to state what may be obvious or there maybe inherent barriers to moving forward on some. Nevertheless, the Task Force believed it to be important to note these recommendations to challenge our current assumptions to take advantage of opportunities for constructive change.

While there are a number of suggestions for consideration for future PPP's, overall the Task Force is confident that the results of this process will be an important tool that will assist in informing the University on how to address its budgetary challenges, future priorities and directions. It is the hope of the Task Force that this process is a catalyst for meaningful change. The University has built a very strong reputation based on its undergraduate, graduate, and research and outreach programs. It is important to focus and invest in those programs that continue to build our reputation.

6. Rankings

The final Program Prioritization Process rankings are shown in Appendix D. They are presented as a list of all of the 492 programs ranked in one of the five quintiles.

7. Observations and Recommendations

The Task Force collectively evaluated all of the programs in the University and was able to gain some valuable insights and identify issues that were common to many PIR Forms. The various issues and opportunities identified by the Task Force have been divided around two

themes: those that address policy and those that address opportunities and efficiencies. Some issues may be included in both themes. The policy issues may be linked to changes in the way various levels of the University operate and interact. Many of the issues are at the institutional level.

7.1 Policy Areas

During the review process, the Task Force noted many common themes in the PIR Forms that related to policy gaps or deficiencies that unless addressed in the future, could hinder opportunities to change. Some of these have evolved over time while others are newly identified. The policy issues relate mainly to teaching (at all levels) and research and range from the general to the specific with varying potential impact University operations. All have potential resource allocation implications.

7.1.1 Distribution of Effort (DOE)

Observation: Faculty activities are defined, in part, by their DOE negotiated with Department Chairs and Deans. The Task Force recognizes that there are current limitations to changing DOE due to collective agreements etc. However, the flexibility of the DOE could be explored more fully (i.e., not just 40-40-20 in teaching-research-service) allowing the DOE to change in response to changing operational needs. A 20% service allocation reflects, on average, one day per week of service and, for many faculty, this may be too high. In some Departments, there is already a move to reduce a typical DOE for service to 10%. Re-deployment for teaching could start with realignment of DOE to more accurately reflect actual activities. There may be potential teaching resources hidden in underutilized service and research components of the DOE.

While it is also recognized that the PIR form may not have fully captured “Service” efforts, a ‘one size fits all’ formula for DOE does not work well for every department. Service includes activities internal and external to the University. There may be a need to negotiate what activities are most valued and recognition that fewer FTEs will be available for internal or external committee work. There are also some faculty with research DOEs that approaches 80% so it would stand to reason that a teaching DOE could approach 80%, providing more resources to support teaching.

Recommendation: It is recommended that Colleges explore their current models for DOE with an aim of unlocking resources that could contribute to the teaching where required.

7.1.2 Instructional Programs: Graduate

Graduate programs tend to fall into two categories. One category of programs is primarily research and thesis based and therefore has a strong connection to the research programs in a given department or school. The second category provides specific training and professional skills (programs are often accredited; e.g., MBA) and are course-based programs. These differences are important however, they both have opportunities for growth. The Task Force noted that strong graduate programs had a well-articulated sense of what they were doing and where they were going. Where there was a clear vision and track record described within the PIR Form, it translated into a higher score. Strong vision helps to build reputation inside and outside of the University.

Observation: The Task Force noted that, in some cases, the use of sessionals and post-doctoral fellows (post-doc) to deliver graduate courses was a sign that a program may not be sustainable because it lacks faculty resources. A number of programs used sessionals or post-docs to deliver graduate courses. For some programs, the use of sessionals and post-docs was an obvious benefit in that these individuals are practitioners in their field and would contribute a valuable practical perspective to the program. However, this was not the case for all Graduate programs.

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that departments explore the use of sessionals and post-doctoral fellows in the delivery of graduate programs to ensure that there are sufficient faculty resources to support the quality and sustainability of the program.

Observation: Some research programs are heavily invested in post-docs and technicians which may be at the expense of graduate student training. A post-doc is usually a person involved in a research intensive training period after the completion of a PhD. It is recognized as a requirement before the start of some careers. However, there are many examples of labs that support post-docs well beyond a normal two year period. It can be easily argued, from an institutional standpoint, that these people are no longer true post-docs and have a different role in the research program. They may work more independently, and take some responsibility for supervising the day-to-day work of graduate students and assist at various levels with grant preparation. Some research programs are delivered with a very high percentage of the lab staff as long-term post-docs. In these cases, the opportunity and obligation to train graduate students is directly challenged. This decreases opportunities for graduate students who contribute tuition and BIU income to the University compared to post-doc training that does not generate BIUs for the University. The incentive to hire multi-year post-docs and contract technicians at the expense of graduate student opportunities should be reduced.

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that Colleges and Departments encourage research programs to take a balanced approach to graduate student training and the use of long-term post docs and contract technicians.

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that Colleges and Departments explore incentives to encourage more graduate student training in research.

Observation: The Task Force recognized that some graduate programs were small, appropriately resourced and very successful. However, there were many, very weak graduate programs with declining enrollments or very low enrolment numbers. This is due, in part, to the evolution of a high number of over-specialized graduate programs. The justification for the continuation of the many graduate programs was not always provided in the PIR Forms. This can be a problem over time as faculty retire and are no longer available to teach courses and advise graduate students. Loss of faculty expertise in programs was noted in many PIR Forms. The same rigorous exercises used to justify and improve undergraduate curricula need to be continually applied to graduate programs. The intended outcomes are fewer courses; more streamlined programs, improved times to completion, lower costs, better quality and improved reputation. To be successful, a graduate program needs specific foci which reflect the expertise within a Department or School.

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends Colleges and Departments conduct regular reviews of their Graduate Programs to explore opportunities to streamline curricula.

Observation: Some new graduate programs are struggling to achieve critical mass or enrolment targets. New graduate programs need to be better justified, have clearly defined inputs and outcomes, and include a business plan (i.e., realistic enrollment targets, growth potential, cost analysis, etc.). In addition, there should be a specific passage of time before they are evaluated (the Task Force was challenged in its ability to review and comment on relatively new programs). Unfortunately, in this era of declining resources there is little opportunity to 'try and fail'.

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that any new proposed graduate program be fully justified and researched with a business plan that includes market-employer surveys and realistic enrolment targets.

Observation: The cost of delivering graduate programs is extremely variable across the University ranging from \$3,738.00 per FTE for the MSC.CHEM to \$29,638.00 per FTE for the DVSC.CLST+VETS. The average was \$10,147.00 per FTE. It is likely that Departments have rarely considered the cost of delivering their graduate programs and need to do further analysis to look at justifying those costs and to identify potential savings in the future. Part of the different costing relates to demographics of salaries within a Department and how Colleges chose to distribute FTE's between research and graduate programs. Some programs such as MFA.SART and OVC graduate programs are very expensive because significant resources are committed to the program and enrolment is low. In light of the current funding restraints, the more expensive programs must be evaluated for sustainability and productivity. In some cases, there may be a need to explore other models of program delivery at reduced costs while maintaining an acceptable level of quality. This may be challenging, but some Departments will be forced to face these realities as budgets decline and their programs are no longer sustainable.

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends Colleges explore the cost of delivering their graduate programs with the aim of justifying and reducing costs relative to similar programs.

Observation: The Task Force noted the benefits of providing financial support for graduate students and the positive influence this would have on the research programs and graduate student training. However several issues were documented during the review.

- a. Graduate numbers are closely linked to research grant funding or graduate teaching assistantships. Without this funding or teaching opportunity, the programs were negatively impacted.
- b. There was great variability across programs in the ability of programs to attract and support high quality graduate students. Some programs observed that neighbouring institutions were offering higher stipends and it was difficult to be competitive.
- c. Graduate Growth and Support funds (provided from central resource allocations) supplied to Colleges were used to directly fund graduate students in some programs while it was not mentioned in others.

Recommendations: The Task Force recommends that the use of Graduate Growth and Support funds be transparent and used to ensure maximum support of graduate students.

Recommendations: The Task Force recommends that the University explore graduate funding models used at other institutions for ideas to support graduate students.

Observation: The Task Force noted that one of the areas where the University can continue to grow the graduate program is with international students. Many PIR Forms noted that the University is missing a significant opportunity to reach out to the world by better supporting the graduate education of international students. However, the ability to do this was severely limited by the extremely high tuition fees charged to international students compared to domestic students. There are several institutions around the world using creative solutions to assist with funding of international students.

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that the University explore and develop creative mechanisms to grow the number of international graduate students.

Observation: The dependency on GTA funding to support graduate students is very different across Departments and Colleges and any reduction in the funding poses a risk to some graduate programs. Sometimes GTA funding is part of a student's stipend and in other instances it is in addition to the stipend. Where GTA support is linked to the resources of the undergraduate program, any changes to the undergraduate program that reduces GTA support will also impact the graduate program.

Recommendation: The University also considers the negative impact on graduate programs in a Department if changes are made to the undergraduate program.

Observation: It was noted that both Graduate Studies and departments are responsible for student recruitment. It was unclear from the PIR Forms who should have the greatest responsibility for this task. The Task Force noted that the tracking of experiences of graduate students both during and after graduation is very limited. This recruitment and post-graduation monitoring can provide important information for determining the impact and outcomes of graduate education. The service role of Graduate Studies needs to be reviewed and resources focused on areas that will have the greatest value for students and the University.

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that Graduate Studies explore opportunities to identify and develop programs that monitor graduate student experiences. For example, an initiative could include the collection of employment data upon graduation with the outcome of assisting new graduates to obtain improved employment opportunities and provide feedback to assist graduate programs with curriculum development.

7.1.3 Instructional Programs: Undergraduate

Many of the majors and minors did not score highly in this process. Many could not demonstrate as a minimum, steady or growing enrolment, quality outputs or essentiality. Specific observations are listed below.

Minors

On the whole, minors tended to score poorly with 80% of minors scoring in the 4th and 5th quintiles. There were 24 minor programs in the fifth quintile, 11 in the fourth quintile, only 8 in quintiles two and three, and none in the first quintile. The following *observations* were made by the Task Force:

- Minors tended to score poorly because they seemingly had little or no external demand because students do not enroll in a minor before entry, and demonstrated only modest internal demand due to their relatively low enrolments.
- Complete costs specific to the Minors were not captured in the PIR Forms. Course enrolments for students with a major and a minor were counted twice thus allocating the costs across both programs. While it is recognized that the costs associated with offering Minors may be marginal, there are variable costs and these costs need to be captured and reported.
- Minor programs had difficulty demonstrating quality outcomes *that were independent* of the corresponding major program.
- Some minor programs had greater enrolment than the corresponding major program, suggesting a different role in the larger curriculum.
- The Task Force noted a difference in scores among minors that seemed to exist only because there was a corresponding major compared to minors that represented a more deliberate attempt to create a unique curriculum. The latter tended to score higher than the former.

While it is believed that minors can be in demand and serve an important purpose, greater control and accountability are required. The report of the Working Group on Secondary Areas of Study (2010) laid the groundwork for policy and rationalization of minors to ensure that the creation of minors was done with purposeful intention. However, what is now required is a review process to evaluate each minor after a 5-year period to ensure that it is meeting its intended outcomes and confirm its continuation.

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends a review of individual Minors be conducted now and at 5-year intervals to assess demand. The review process should be led by the Associate Vice-President, (Academic).

Recommendation: Data associated with the specific costs of Minors be collected and reported to assist in decision making for potential rationalization.

Bachelor of Arts, General (BAG)

Observation: The Bachelor of Arts, General (BAG) programs tended to suffer from many of the same deficiencies as the minor programs: lack of demand and difficulty demonstrating quality outcomes independent of the corresponding honours program. On the other hand, the Task Force recognized that in *some* cases, the BAG program did serve a valuable purpose other than as a 'consolation prize' for those students who could not complete the honours program, however those purposes did not seem to be well captured by the PIR Form. For example students continuing on to professional schools (e.g., Law) often elect to complete the BAG and take admission to the professional school.

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that a review of BAG programs be conducted to determine cost-effectiveness and essentiality to the institution.

Major Programs

Generally, majors were equally distributed across the quintiles. Two characteristics of low scoring majors were small size, and/or new programs (<5-7 years). New programs were unable to demonstrate demand, size, or outcomes. Established programs that did not score well suffered from similar problems. Small programs did not generally score well.

Observation: The Task Force noted a large number of highly specialized, very small major programs. This fracturing of a larger program into several, or in some cases many, smaller programs, tended to make the individual parts appear potentially weaker than the whole. An example of this was International Development. The IDEV major has seven areas of specialization.

Recommendation: Colleges and program committees examine the potential to consolidate majors into stronger more sustainable programs.

Observation: Several programs were defended on the basis that their subject area was now part of the secondary school curriculum. This would eventually lead to higher enrolment because students would be familiar with the subject and it would be a 'teachable' subject for those entering teachers college. However, the forecasted demand (five to seven years later) has not, as yet, appeared to have translated into increased enrolment in these programs. The result has been static or declining enrolment for some programs.

Recommendation: Where appropriate, the Task Force recommends that Colleges establish the link between curricula change at the high school level and resource allocation and curricula development in their programs. If this link is established, it could be used as a tool to predict future demand.

Observation: Many Colleges offer a generalized major such as Honours Biology (CBS) or Honours Agriculture (OAC) which attract a high percentage of students in the College at the expense of enrolment in the more specialized majors. The specialized majors remain extremely valuable because they often define the uniqueness and contribute to the reputation of the institution. Advisors indicate students choose the unspecialized programs because of the belief that those programs provide more flexibility in programming and allow greater freedom of choice for courses. As a result some students choose to 'shadow' the major while enrolled in the unspecialized program. This presents a dilemma for the Program Committees and raises the question as to why so many students prefer an

unspecialized honours program compared to the Majors where a great deal of attention is focused. This is an important question in light of the low numbers in some majors.

Recommendation: Program Committees undertake a study coordinated through the AVPA's office to determine role of specialized versus unspecialized majors at this University.

Observation: There was a tremendous variation in the per FTE cost of delivery of different programs across colleges and departments for undergraduate majors and minors. The costs ranged from \$164.00 (ADEV-Ma) to \$549.00 (EM-Ma) with the mean of \$274.00 for all programs. The instructional PIR Forms rarely commented on the reason for the higher or lower expense associated with their program.

Recommendation: Colleges use relevant data to examine and justify program costs and take appropriate steps to bring costs in line with similar programs.

Sessional Teaching

Observation: It is clear from this process that the use of sessional instructors varies widely across the university. Some programs, particularly at Guelph-Humber, seem to exist almost entirely on sessional instructors. Other programs use sessional instructors sparingly, if at all. In some cases there are good pedagogical reasons for using sessional instructors. For example, the use of professional practitioners can complement faculty expertise and provide a 'real world' perspective in a course. In addition, using retired faculty as instructors provides a pedagogical and financial benefit. In other cases, sessionals are merely temporary substitutes for RFT Faculty, who have been lost through retirement. In general, the rationale for sessional use was poorly explained. Programs that seemed to be dependent on general sessional instructors to deliver large sections of a program were generally awarded low scores and viewed as possibly unsustainable.

Recommendation: Where appropriate, the role of sessional appointments be examined for relevance and effectiveness to the curriculum. Where high numbers of sessionals are used on a consistent basis, it would be appropriate to examine resourcing issues and the number and methods used for course delivery.

7.1.3 International Development (IDEV)

Observation: As an entity, IDEV currently appears to be an orphaned and fragmented unit. There are seven majors but the IDEV Program has three courses which are specific to the program; the Program draws heavily on courses from other units. As a result, the program has little curricular control, lacks resources, and, in short - needs attention before it flounders. Some of the areas of emphasis are doing well while others struggle. Compared with other institutions in Canada, where IDEV is frequently housed in its own department or centre, the program at Guelph is dispersed across units. Only because of a few unique offerings and reputation of faculty/departments, is Guelph still somewhat competitive in attracting students for IDEV. However, as more cohesive and structured programs develop and grow in stature at other institutions, Guelph will become a less desirable choice for international development studies.

Recommendation. The University and Colleges involved in IDEV consider streamlining the offerings within the discipline and focus on one or two main areas of emphasis.

Observation: It was recognized that the IDEV is an interdisciplinary program and therefore, requires coordination across colleges. To date, one individual has administered the IDEV programs and their efforts are applauded. However, if the University is committed to providing this program, the program needs an academic home and faculty.

Recommendation: The IDEV Programs be provided an academic home, possibly within the School for Civil Society, and that a curriculum committee be established to streamline and oversee course and program offerings.

7.1.4 Research Programs

Research and graduate programs are key strengths at the University of Guelph and are often very closely linked. Thirteen research programs appear in the first quintile with seven appearing in the top 15 highest scoring programs. The relative strength of research programs does however, vary across the university. High profile research programs (e.g., Biodiversity Centre) and researchers (eg. CRC Chairs) can attract human and financial resources based in part, on having built a strong reputation. In contrast, there appears to be many small research programs that show little or no research output. The following comments help to explain this diversity, provide insight into the ranking of various programs and offer a number of suggestions or recommendations.

The Task Force noted the great strengths and diversity of research conducted by this University. Research supports all of the themes of the Better Planet Project (BPP) and University Strategic Research Plan, provides cutting edge knowledge for our undergraduate programs, underpins our graduate programs and significantly enhances our international reputation...and more. Although the academic engine may drive the institution, the research programs contribute a great deal to our reputation. Four Colleges, OAC, OVC, CBS and CPES are consistently high performers in research. Some of the qualities linked to their success are inputs such as internationally recognized faculty and large amounts of funding from the Tri-councils and a diversity of other sources. In almost all cases, these funds are significant inputs and the drivers behind some of the larger graduate programs on campus. There are very successful research programs in other colleges that have good levels of funding on a relative basis and have strong scholarly output that comes in many different forms.

It is very important to emphasize that although MTCU may fund the graduate programs, it is often the faculty, through their research funding, who provide the stipend and the funding to support the research conducted by graduate and undergraduate students. For our graduate programs to succeed, the two must be in partnership. Strong research programs also return overhead revenues to several levels of the institution which can have some significant and positive effects at the University, college and departmental levels.

Observation: The strongest research programs had a diverse and high percentage of faculty engaged in delivery of the research. The strongest research programs did an excellent job of documenting productivity with a high level of sustained output of recognized scholarly works. In many Departments where Research Chairs are housed, there is a real and positive impact on the entire department and a great boost in reputation for the University.

When present, it was evident from the PIR Forms that the Research Chairs were real drivers of the research enterprise in terms of funding, provision of equipment and graduate student numbers. One of the original goals of the BPP was to create a high number of Research Chairs.

Recommendation: The University makes the creation of Research Chairs a priority, especially if they are externally funded.

Observation: There are many Departments with weak research programs even allowing for the difference in disciplines. The Task Force noted that weaker programs did not deliver the added benefits associated with the stronger research programs. There was often great disparity between funding levels in the sciences versus the arts. However, this was expected and consistent between disciplines. The impact of the lower funding levels was seen in the reduced ability of faculty to provide funding to support graduate students. The weaker programs often had a few key faculty (i.e. low percentage of total compliment), who were very strong researchers, but delivered most of the research enterprise and graduate training in their Department. Relying on just a small percentage of faculty presents a high risk situation because, in the event of a retirement or departure of one of these key faculty, both the research and graduate programs can be severely and negatively impacted. The Task Force noted that valuable faculty FTE's were committed to weak research programs and questioned if these could be better deployed on other activities. There needs to be a recognition that every faculty does not have a research program that warrants a 40% DOE. The Task Force observed that one of the areas where Departments are trying to strengthen their research programs is with new hires. However, several hires would be required to develop a strong Departmental research program and this may not be possible in the current fiscal climate.

Recommendation: DOE needs to remain flexible to allow resources to be shifted between research, service and teaching. The viability of some scholarly research programs needs to be evaluated.

7.1.5 Physical Space

Observation: The lack of appropriate classroom space on the main campus was noted as a challenge in some programs. The role of Scheduling in the assignment of classroom space was deemed essential. However, if the expectation is that there is academic transformation and teaching innovation, the systems that support this must be flexible in order to facilitate these processes. The lack of flexibility in the current scheduling system prevents the university from making effective use of its physical resources. Classrooms are assigned for the entire semester based on a consistent timeslot. However, that timeslot may not be required each week and, therefore, there is an opportunity for the space to be released and used for another class or another purpose. In addition, the lack of flexibility stifles the use of innovative pedagogies including the development of a blended learning strategy.

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends the University explore ways to evolve the scheduling system to allow for greater flexibility and to support academic transformation.

Observation: Several programs also addressed the lack of adequate departmental space. Physical space is a scarce resource that needs proper management and oversight.

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that the University develop a space management strategy that includes enhanced communication between the Space Management program and departments to assist in identifying opportunities to make more effective use of physical space.

7.2 Opportunities and Efficiencies

One of the directives under the PPP was for the Task Force to identify potential unrealized synergies and collaborations across units, in the context of achieving efficiencies, minimizing duplication and leveraging opportunities. This was an inherently challenging task, requiring a broad over-arching view of the entirety of both instructional and non-instructional programs offered by the institution. During the review process, several areas were observed to be potential beneficiaries of restructuring, streamlining and/or centralization. Interestingly, several of these were self-identified on individual PIR Forms.

7.2.1 Revenue Generation

Departments need to find methods of generating new net revenue. With proper market analysis, and proper institutional support and expertise, both professional and specialized programs may be potential revenue generators and fit well with pedagogical missions or mandates. While it is important not to lose sight of the fact that the University's mandate is to provide undergraduate, graduate education and research, attracting new sources of funding will be critical to the institution's ability to invest and innovate.

Observation: It was observed that some Colleges are intent on generating new revenue through entrepreneurial activities such as non-degree courses/programs. While expanding the revenue base is critical, decentralizing these activities can be costly to the institution. Non-degree programs, including customized and market-driven programs, also present an opportunity for new revenue generation. With innovative pedagogical and technical approaches, the University can continue to extend the teaching and research expertise to lifelong learners. Continuing to strategically invest in these opportunities will expand the institution's reach and revenue base.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the development and delivery of non-degree courses/programs intended to reach external markets be the responsibility of one centralized department. The development and delivery of non-degree opportunities should be supported with the appropriate needs analysis, business plan, quality control and client services.

Observation: Several undergraduate programs on campus must maintain professional accreditation. This requires that defined standards are maintained for faculty and staffing complements as well as the quality of facilities. Maintaining this standard may be cost prohibitive for the University when resources are scarce, even though the program may generate higher BIUs. The opportunity may exist to increase tuition fees for programs that require accreditation and have higher expectations of career income.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the University explore the potential of differential tuition fees for those programs that require accreditation.

7.2.2 Evaluation of Ancillary Operations

Ancillary operations provide an important service to the university community as well as provide an important source of revenue that can further advance the work of the academic enterprise.

Observation: It was often difficult to assess the financial performance of ancillary operations and the expectations of return on investment to the University. Budgets used to populate the PIR forms were often based on historical information and may not reflect the actual 'current' situation in several cases. In addition, some forms included revenue or cost items that were not actually part of the base budget. As a result, it was difficult to assess the financial health of an ancillary operation and therefore, raised questions regarding financial target expectations, ROI and overall operational effectiveness.

Recommendation: Financial targets for ancillary units should be established and monitored to ensure the revenue generation and cost controlling are balanced with service expectations. Units not able to meet targets should be considered for restructuring, outsourcing or a discontinuation of service.

7.2.3 Curriculum Changes

Teaching

Observation: The rankings show a number of undergraduate programs in the 4th and 5th quintile. Several reasons can be attributed to this performance including low enrolments in majors and minor programs, and some very expensive programs, that negatively affect productivity. There was also a lack of evidence of how these programs contribute to the University's Integrated Plan and overall essentiality.

Recommendation: It is recommended that a review of low enrolment programs be conducted with the intended outcome to reduce the number of low enrolment programs/offerings and to seek out opportunities for collaboration with other institutions to deliver courses that fulfill low enrolment majors.

Observation: The recent adoption of learning outcomes at the undergraduate and graduate levels will allow the institution to measure and report to the government, students, parents and community on the value of university post-secondary education. Learning outcomes will also be an important internal metric to report on quality and assess programs.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the University provide support and assistance for integrating, tracking and assessing the learning outcomes at the program and course level.

Observation: An exploration of whether common core courses across programs on the main campus could be streamlined and taught in perhaps non-traditional ways should be undertaken. The use of technology for efficiencies should be continually investigated (e.g. podcasting, videoconferencing). Ongoing mapping of curricula to learning outcomes should additionally help focus and streamline academic programs. In some cases, the introductory

core courses such as statistics or math, are taught in several courses because of a perceived requirement for specialization.

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that departments explore opportunities to streamline curriculum and reduce the number of similar core courses offered.

Observation: The Task Force observed that joint programs were very cost effective. For example, the joint program in chemistry between Guelph and Waterloo had one of the lowest delivery costs at Guelph. There are likely similar benefits to Waterloo. Increased sharing of resources between units and with neighbouring universities (sometimes at a distance) could benefit Guelph students, enhance expertise, provide joint programs, and share costs.

Recommendation: It is recommended that low enrolment and/or costly graduate programs explore opportunities and synergies for sharing of resources to build stronger and more sustainable programs.

Observation: The Task Force noted a proliferation of common courses being offered in several programs. For example, courses such as research methods or statistics are offered in several programs. There are opportunities to reduce the number of courses offered by incorporating learning outcomes and streamlining programs. In addition, making effective use of teaching and learning technologies can reduce the number of course sections required while continuing to promote active learning.

Recommendation: It is recommended that a review of specialized foundational courses be undertaken to identify opportunities to cross-list courses, to reduce offerings and to incorporate technology and reduce the number of sections required.

Observation: The Task Force observed that many programs were unable to articulate the outcomes of their graduates, especially the employment of graduates in the field of their majors. Graduate tracking is increasingly important, given the demand for broader public accountability.

Recommendation: Increased collaboration and information sharing between Alumni Affairs and Development and programs would be helpful. While it is recognized that activities such as fundraising needs to be centralized, there are institutional benefits if there is continued communication between the alumni and College including tracking, philanthropic, industry connections, and the promotion of lifelong learning opportunities.

Recommendation: A review of other University best practices on how to track graduates should be conducted.

Observation: Several programs indicated that, while they were engaged in curriculum restructuring, departments were still required to offer courses that no longer formed part of the new program in order to meet the needs of students currently in progress. This discourages departments from making curriculum changes due to the fact that that it can actually increase costs 4 to 5 years before any savings are realized.

Recommendation: The University should examine mechanisms that decrease the financial burden assumed by departments as programs are restructured to create efficiencies.

7.2.4 Restructuring

Colleges

Large scale opportunities for re- and de-investing were difficult to identify at the PIR form level as many units (instructional and non-instructional alike) were fragmented by their numerous program level forms which prevented the Task Force from seeing the larger, interconnected nature and value of many of these programs.

Observation: The Task Force observed that there is a need to create a vision of the University of Guelph for both the medium and longer-term horizons such that any allocations or cuts are conducted strategically to strengthen what is core to Guelph and what differentiates Guelph positively from other institutions. In order to accomplish this task, the upper administration will need to show strong and decisive leadership, especially on issues that cross college and service teaching boundaries. The recent Science review will help inform decision making. This high level leadership and vision, in particular, will be required where extensive restructuring may be necessary to streamline historic divisions and overlaps such as:

- Four colleges offering science degrees (CBS, CPES, OAC, & OVC)
- Two colleges offering economics degrees (CME & OAC)
- Two units offering various forms of human nutrition (FRAN and HHNS) with a third unit focused on food science (Food Science)

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that the University examine the possibility of restructuring Colleges with one possibility being mergers of Colleges.

Regional Campuses/Guelph Humber

The University maintains several remote regional campuses (Ridgetown, Kemptville and Alfred) and research stations. These three campuses differ from the main campus in that the land and buildings are provincially owned and funding for the diploma programs comes from a MTCU fund (104) that is different than the funding envelope used for the main campus. However, PPP will help to direct the future development of these campuses. There is also a long-standing partnership with Guelph-Humber. It was recognized that there are potential areas for increased efficiency between these off-site locations and main campus. These opportunities are outlined below.

Observation: Numerous support services are required to administer the mandate of a large institution such as the University of Guelph. Due to the substantial size of main campus, the majority of required services are available on-site. As was identified on some of the regional campus PIR Forms (Alfred, Kemptville and Ridgetown), there may be areas where these remote sites can take advantage of centralized or online services offered and administered through the main campus. In addition, there may also be similar services offered at the Guelph-Humber campus that could also benefit from increased online functionality or centralization with main campus.

Some of the possible opportunities for efficiencies in centralizing or streamlining services that were identified by the Task Force include:

- registrarial services
- admissions
- human resources
- financial services
- physical resources
- environmental health and safety
- research support

Recommendation: It is recommended that the appropriate administrative bodies examine and adopt centralized expertise and support available on the main campus, recognizing that certain functions will always need to be maintained locally.

Observation: There may be common course links between the main campus, regional campuses and/or Guelph-Humber which could take better advantage of expertise – in either direction as appropriate. Working with Open Learning and Educational Support, better links with main campus curricula could be identified, which may include efficiencies in online course offerings, video conferencing, and podcasting of lectures. The three regional campuses deliver the same diploma curriculum in some areas and need to be working very closely for optimum productivity and efficiency. The PIR forms did not describe a high level of cooperation between the regional campuses. This is distressing in the face of declining funding envelopes.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the three regional campuses examine the possibility of restructuring curriculum in Diploma programs to capture synergies around curriculum development and delivery.

Recommendation: It is recommended that opportunities to cross-list courses between UofG and Guelph Humber be explored.

Observation: There are substantial facilities at the three regional campuses and research stations. Careful study needs to be conducted to ensure that the facilities are being efficiently utilized. These campuses need to address the issue of expansion or contraction with the aim of making them more sustainable. The Task Force observed that the facilities may be under-utilized given the very small size of some of the programs. Alfred and Kemptville are geographically very close and there appears to be many reasons for a closer association between these two colleges, although the Task Force recognized the difference in the working language used at these two campuses (Alfred delivers education, services and research in French, while Kemptville uses English). Some of the similarities we noted were diploma teaching, international activities, Business Development Centres (BDC) and conference services. Both have the same funding model and must rely on their BDC to generate revenue for fiscal survival. As such, the activities of the BDC and staff must be focused on revenue generation. Alfred has obtained a great deal of funding for international activities but there was no indication how those monies benefitted the campus. There are also instructional programs with very low enrolments, poor rates of completion and very high costs that need to be examined for their continuation.

Recommendation: It is recommended that, at the regional campuses, new pedagogies, delivery models and collaboration be considered.

Recommendation: It is recommended that consideration be given to merging the two campuses in eastern Ontario to create efficiencies and strengthen programs.

7.2.5 Distance Education

Observation: Distance Education plays an important role in the delivery of undergraduate education. Enrolments have increased 26% over the past 5-years. The Task Force noted that many programs will continue to use DE courses and plan to introduce new DE courses as a mechanism to cope with declining resources. This is seen as a critical component of program delivery with the added benefit of revenue generation. Open Learning is one of the University's five (5) strategic directions and Distance Education positions the University as a leader in online learning at a pivotal time when the Provincial Government is targeting online learning as a means to increase access to post-secondary education.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the University increase support to encourage the development and redevelopment of DE offerings and promote the University's leadership position in online learning.

7.2.6 Administrative Functions

Centralization

Observation: The Task Force observed several programs employing expertise that was also available centrally. For example, computing support and IT services is provided centrally through CCS but is also made available in several programs. It is recognized that there may be unique expertise required in certain areas (such as the OVC Health Sciences Centre) or that the volume of services required demands a dedicated resource. However, there may be opportunities for efficiencies with the adoption of a more centralized model of IT support. In addition, centralizing these services eliminates the potential exposure the university has to data security breaches and management.

Web hosting and development is an activity that is undertaken in most every department on this campus. While some of this work is performed by CCS, much of this work is decentralized within individual departments and/or is outsourced. Promoting a centralized model of web development and support will not only create efficiencies, but also ensure that graphic standards are met, ensure appropriate sustainable technologies are used in the development and delivery and ensure that the institution's web presence is AODA compliant.

Recommendation: It is recommended that core business systems and services such as desktop support, data security, management and web development and hosting be made available centrally and where appropriate, funded on a cost-recovery basis.

Centers or Institutes

Observation: The Task Force noted that there were centers or institutes where no faculty or staff were assigned and these do not appear sustainable. Without the allocation of dedicated resources, it is questionable as to the sustainability and effectiveness of such units. An example of a successful institute is the Biodiversity Institute.

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends the continued review of centers and institutes to ensure these structures are meeting their mandate with meaningful and sustainable contributions to the University.

Business Processes

Observation: The Task Force noted that there may be processes that are resource intensive and that may be candidates for streamlining. For example, OR5's require a complete array of signatures for every grant and could be scaled down to reflect the value of the grant. Currently, major requests, such as faculty release time, need full approval no matter what the value. Another example is the request to fill established positions. Currently, a significant amount of documentation is required by the Hiring and Review Committee in order to complete a formal review and provide approval. In addition, the time between the submission to HRC and the approval to begin the recruitment phase can be several weeks. This presents significant challenges to departments as they are required to fill vacant positions temporarily, reallocate work to other employees, discontinue service or are unable to pursue new opportunities.

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends that a review of resource and time intensive business processes be conducted to look for opportunities for streamlining.

Ancillary Units

Observation: The rankings suggest that there are some ancillary units that are functioning at less than optimal levels of performance. This could be a result of a change in demand, over resourced or ineffective cost control. There are several examples of this. Some services provided by Physical Resources were unable to provide evidence that supported the quality and impact of the service to the campus community. The Campus Bookstore failed to demonstrate a vision and evolution to the changes in the publishing industry. Mail Services appeared to be ineffective in scaling inputs in an era of declining demand.

Recommendation: The Task Force recommends a review of all ancillary units ranked in the 4th and 5th quintile to determine essentiality, and opportunities for restructuring or outsourcing.

Internationalism

Observation: Internationalism is one of the University's five (5) strategic directions yet the promotion of internationalism on-campus is dispersed and not well-resourced. If the University is serious about fulfilling this commitment, it is recommended that an investment in supporting international activities on campus must be explored. This includes an investment in resources to support the recruitment, transition and success of

international students, providing U of G students with international experiences and creating a central repository for international activities across the campus.

Recommendation: It is recommended that resources be allocated to develop and implement a coordinated international strategy that includes recruitment, transition and success of all international students.

8. Appendix A: PIR-Form

The image shows the cover of a form titled "University of Guelph Program Prioritization 2012/2013 Programs Information Request Form". The text is centered on a black rectangular background. Below this, the date "NOVEMBER 28, 2012" is displayed inside a dashed rectangular box.

University of Guelph

Program Prioritization 2012/2013

Programs Information Request Form

NOVEMBER 28, 2012

Program Prioritization

Program Prioritization is a structured assessment process that examines an organization's activities expressed as programs and services (not organizational units) and ranks that program or services in order of priority using a consistent set of criteria. The University of Guelph is initiating this process for the first time in 2012 using a model that can be found in a publication by Robert .C Dickeson¹.

The following principles will guide the development and implementation of the *Program Prioritization*:

- **Transparent:** The criteria used to rank each program will be the same and well-publicized in advance of the study. All reports and descriptions of the process (including all Program Information Forms) will be available to all members of the University community once they are completed.
- **Comprehensive:** The criteria will be broad in scope so as to encompass all aspects of a program.
- **Consistent:** The same criteria will be applied consistently to each program for ranking purposes: only their unit of measure can change as appropriate.
- **Inclusive:** All programs – instructional, student service, and administrative – will be analyzed, and all units will have the opportunity to contribute in the analysis of their program(s). The scope of *Program Prioritization* includes all activities in the MTCU and Ancillary funded operations. It excludes those activities captured under the OMAFRA agreement (Funds 110 and 111).
- **Mission-driven:** The process will measure the demand for programs as determined by students, employers, or external or internal constituents and in the context of its contribution to meeting the missions and goals of the University of Guelph..
- **Data-Based:** The analysis will be based on both quantitative and qualitative data. All data submitted must be sourced and relevant to the program.

Assessment is a critical component in the University's Integrated Plan. Program Prioritization is one of the key processes that will be employed as part of this on-going requirement. The timing of Program Prioritization cycles can vary but they are run at intervals as part of on-going assessment activities. More on Program Prioritization at the University can be found at <http://www.uoguelph.ca/vpacademic/planning/>.

¹ Dickeson , R. C. *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services(Revised and Updated): Reallocating Resources to Achieve Strategic Balance*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 2010.

University of Guelph

Program Information Request Form

Purpose of this Form

The Program Information Request Form (PIR-Form) is designed to assist unit managers and Department Chairs prepare information that will be used to rank programs and services (*collectively referred to as programs in this document*) as part of the Program Prioritization Process (PPP) at the University of Guelph.

The form will provide the PPP Task Force with the core information on which they will evaluate and rank all “programs”, as defined. The information provided in this form will be both quantitative and qualitative in nature.

The specific objective of PPP will be to rank each program in one of five equally populated quintiles i.e., 20%/20%/20%/20%/20%, based on program count (and not e.g., size of its budget). While verifiable and relevant quantitative information is important, a significant component of the form will be written qualitative information about the program in the context of each criteria. It is very important that unit managers who are completing this form reflect on all of the criteria recognizing that some will be more relevant to certain programs than others.

Academic and Non-Academic Programs: There is only one form for all programs. However, recognizing the differences among academic and non-academic programs, particularly in regard to clients and program and services deliverables, different information under each of the criteria will be required. In all other respects the PPP is the same for all programs.

Defining a Program; a “program” can be defined as an activity or collection of activities that consume resources. Programs are used in the PPP to evaluate what (activities and services) the university does not who (organizational unit) does it. A program can cross organization boundaries and be delivered by several departments. In many organizations, tracking resources by program is an on-going component of reporting (financial and otherwise). At the University of Guelph program “accounting” is in a limited number of areas the main one being activities in the OMAFRA Agreement. Therefore as a prerequisite to completing this form, all units must have first identified programs they deliver and then have allocated their organizational unit budgets into those programs. (There is a separate “costing” process and set of procedures developed to meet this requirement.) While there are many different programs at the University of Guelph, there are two major differentiators: programs specific to the delivery of academic activities (collectively referred to as the “Instructional and Research” program group) and

Nov.28, 2012

p. 3 of 22

University of Guelph

Program Information Request Form

programs that support those academic programs. For the most part programs in Instruction and Research program group will be assigned to departments by the “centre” (e.g., Resource Planning and Analysis- RPA will determine the MTCU degree-credit programs in each department). The department-program combination identified in this process is a program that normally will require its own PIR-Form.

Outcomes of Program Prioritization Process - 2012

The key outcome or deliverable of the Program Prioritization Process will be a report to the President and Vice-Presidents that presents the results of the ranking process and any other significant recommendations that the Task Force may support. The report will then be used to help inform a number of decisions including the assignment of multi-year budget targets (in fiscal 2014/2015) and meeting the goals of the University’s second Integrated Plan (2012-2017).

A further outcome will be the on-going requirement that the University’s resources will be tracked by Program as well as the current dimension of organization unit. The University’s chart of accounts (used to record all financial transactions) will be updated to capture program information (budget and actual) for all types of revenues and expenses down to the transaction level. This will assist in enabling and improving the information for future rounds of the prioritization process as well as the day to day management of resources.

Completing the Program Information Request Form (PIR - Form)

The *Program Prioritization* will make use of the ten criteria proposed by Dickeson (2010), tailored to the University of Guelph. The PIR-Form is organized around the ten criteria with each criterion carrying a different “weight” reflecting its relative importance in the ranking process. Because of the significant work load required to rank ALL University programs and to keep information focused to that most relevant to the program, there will be word and data limits. No web links provided will be considered and the only “attachment” that will be accepted will be an organization chart (one page) if it is applicable.

Data on the Form: Throughout the PIR-Form you will find two basic types of questions; those that are mainly narrative and those for which centrally provided quantitative data is required. Some data is provided by program, other is provided by department. Please use this data to populate the appropriate sections of the PIR-Form (when requested) or help inform your responses to questions. You may

University of Guelph

Program Information Request Form

comment on the centrally provided data in your narrative responses. Units may also provide other quantitative data as long as it is verifiable, applicable to the specific program and can be accommodated in the space limits provided. The Task Force may also ask for additional data as part of their deliberations.

A number of questions are proposed at the beginning of each set of criteria to assist in the completion of this form. These are designed to guide those completing this form; they are not prescriptive. There is no formulaic method by which to complete this form. It is very much up to unit managers to determine the specific information they wish to provide the Task Force. The objective is to provide the most relevant information you can that succinctly describes the program for each criteria. It is highly recommended that Department Chairs, Directors, Managers completing this form work with all members engaged in the program, including students, to gather the most accurate and relevant information. It is important that all criteria (sections of the form) are completed. The following section describes each of the criteria. To summarize, some key instructions/considerations regarding this form are:

1. **One form per program.** (In some cases where a small program is located in several departments across a college/division, they may be consolidated on a single PIR-Form and assigned an "author". In these cases Chairs, Managers etc. are expected to work together to complete the PIR-Form.)
2. **Respect word limits and do not attach additional information or provide external web links.** Word tables may be used however the word count limits will include table data. Graphs/Charts may be imported as "pictures" however the use of these must be limited to one per written question. (The questions that are in a structured table format do allow an image – questions 4.1, 7.1, 7.2, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, and 9.1).
3. **While you may not be able to answer all of the questions under each criterion it is important that each criterion has a response.**
4. **"Authors" are encouraged to consult with major constituents/clients of the program, including students, and they should note any such consultations in the relevant criteria.**
5. **There are no right/wrong answers. The objective to describe the program in a clear and succinct way, consistent with the format of this form. Data and other representations on the form will be verified so it is very important to ensure you can support your statements.**

Nov.28, 2012

p. 5 of 22

University of Guelph

Program Information Request Form

6. There will be a number of resources available to help as much as possible in the completion of this form.

Contact and Help Information

Questions on:

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 1. The Base budget data or classification: | Budget Office |
| 2. Enrolment/student data or classification | RPA |
| 3. Form logistics (sending/receiving) | CCS Help |

Nov.28, 2012

p. 6 of 22

University of Guelph
Program Information Request Form

Program Information

Program Name

College/Division

Primary Department (Name & Number)

Author

Submitter

1. History and Development of the Program Weighting: 5 Points - Word Limit: 300

History and Development of the Program: This criterion aims to determine when and why the program was first started, and how its mission may have changed since its inception. It seeks to answer questions such as: Why was the program established. What were the institution's original expectations of the program? How has it evolved over the years? How has the environment and context in which it operates changed? In what ways has it adapted to meet these changes? Information provided in this section will be mainly qualitative and is intended to provide focused context and background on the program recognizing opportunities for providing further information/data on recent experience in other criteria.

1. Describe the history and development of your program.

University of Guelph

Program Information Request Form

2. External Demand for the Program

Weighting: 10 Points - Word Limit: 600

External Demand for the Program: This criterion assesses the demand for the program by the external community, e.g., students (incoming or prospective), employers, visitors, government/agencies or the local community. While this criterion is most relevant to instructional programs, many student service and administrative service programs serve the external community to some extent. It seeks to answer questions such as: What has the demand trend for the program been? Are comparable programs at other institutions experiencing similar trends? What is the likely potential for future demand? What are the characteristics of the program's clients (e.g., students/users/customers)? Do these forecast an increase or decrease in the demand for the program? Are there current or proposed legislative requirements that may impact the necessity of the program? [Weighting of 10 points]

1. Describe the demand for the program: For example what has been the trend for the numbers/types of external "clients" (e.g., students/users/customers) over the past five years (or less). If client trends are not available, use revenue or some other indicator of total demand.
2. Provide your forecast for future demand for the program and why.
3. What external factors affect the demand for this program and what are the expected changes to these if any in the near term? Factors could include government policy demands, geographical advantages, legislative requirements, competition from other institutions or industry/economic drivers.

University of Guelph

Program Information Request Form

4. Are there other comments you can make about this program that are relevant to this criteria (cite the source or evidence if possible).

Nov.28, 2012

p. 9 of 22

University of Guelph

Program Information Request Form

3. Internal Demand for the Program

Weighting: 10 Points - Word Limit: 600

Internal Demand for the Program: This criterion assesses the demand for the program by the internal community, e.g., registered students from other programs, employees or other University programs. While this criterion is most relevant to student service and administrative programs, some instructional programs exist primarily as a support for other programs. It seeks to answer questions similar to those posed in (2), with the demand being evaluated now internal rather than external: What services does the program provide to other college programs or units? What has the internal demand trend for the program been? What is the likely potential for future demand? What are the characteristics of the program's customers? Do these forecast an increase or decrease in the demand for the program? Are there current or proposed legislative requirements that may impact the demand of the program?

1. Describe the demand for the program: For example what has been the trend for how many internal "clients" (e.g., registered students /employees /other University programs) use this service over the past five years (or less). For instructional programs, describe the level of support that is provided to other degree programs. An example of this could be programs of "Other Secondary Areas of Study". If client numbers are not available, use revenue or some other indicator of total demand.
2. Provide your forecast for future demand for the program and why.
3. What internal factors affect the demand for this program and what are the expected changes to these if any in the near term? Factors could include University policy/procedure demands, geographical advantages, legislative requirements or industry/economic drivers.
4. Are there other comments you can make about this program that are relevant to this criteria (cite the source or evidence if possible).

4. Quality of Program Inputs Weighting: 10 Points - Word Limit: 600

Quality of Program Inputs: Rather than quantity, this criterion looks to measure the quality of a program's inputs, such as employees, students, curricula, technology, and facilities. This is not an expression of the success of the program but a statement on the existing quality of the resources program that deliver the program. It seeks to answer questions such as: What are the qualifications of the program faculty and staff? What is the program readiness of students, as measured by high school entrance averages or other measures? How current is the curriculum? To what degree has the program taken advantage of technology to enhance learning? How modern are the program facilities and equipment?

1. Describe the quality/qualification of the resources delivering in this program. Consider employee credentials, profiles, scores, awards, accreditations, certifications, licensure, etc. Where program specific information is not available, other qualities/qualifications measures may be used such as department (be sure to ensure if other measure is used you can justify it in the context of this program).

Faculty	Qualifications, awards, reputation etc.
Sessionals	Qualifications, experience, etc.
GTA	Qualifications, experience, etc.
Staff	Qualifications, experience, etc.
Students	Entering averages, profiles, awards etc.

University of Guelph

Program Information Request Form

Equipment	Where applicable, age, access, adequacy planning for replacement etc.
Technology	Where applicable, age, access, adequacy planning for replacement etc.
Facilities/space	Where applicable, age, access, adequacy planning for replacement etc.
Other	e.g., quality/accessibility of other service/support providers to the program

2. Are there other comments you can make about this program that are relevant to this criteria (cite the source or evidence if possible).

University of Guelph

Program Information Request Form

5. Quality of Program Outcomes Weighting: 15 Points - Word Limit: 600

Quality of Program Outputs: Rather than quantity, this criterion seeks to measure the quality of the program's outputs, such as student learning, student or client satisfaction, student outcomes, faculty scholarship, and professional recognition. An inherently difficult task, the assessment of outcomes will rely on external validation of quality where possible. There will also be significant distinctions in terms of information/measures between academic and non-academic programs. Academic programs can use metrics such as for "research" programs the number, description and/or type of faculty research grants/awards, application success rates, patents, publications. Instructional programs could use student success indicators e.g, graduation rates, NSSE results. Non-academic programs may use external benchmark comparators, internal success measures and/or recent initiatives/innovations to add to/enhance program outcomes.

Describe the quality of your program outcomes/deliverables.

Nov.28, 2012

p. 13 of 22

University of Guelph

Program Information Request Form

6. Size, Scope and Productivity of the Program

Weighting: 12 Points - Word Limit: 600

***Size, Scope and Productivity of the Program:** This criterion measures mainly the quantity of a program's inputs and outputs without regard to quality (see criteria 4 and 5 for discussions of quality). Primarily descriptive and quantitative, this criterion seeks to answer questions such as: How many courses or services are offered by the program? How many students or clients are served? How many faculty and staff are assigned? How many projects are underway? [Weighting of 12 points]*

1. How many clients (internal and/or external) are served by the program? Include in this section data on total numbers. (This section should be mainly data with a few footnotes)
2. Describe range and depth of the services that this program provides to internal and external stakeholders. Programs may be very focused in nature or provide a wider range of services/deliverables to clients. Describe the client base, for example is there a significant diversity in clients in terms of measure such as geographic, demographic or sector (e.g., public, private).
3. Can productivity be effectively described and/or measured? If not, why not. If so, describe, the productivity of this program. For example: Instructional programs may demonstrate faculty to student ratios, research can show dollars per faculty.
4. What is the outlook for productivity of the program in the future? Comment on innovations or improvements recent or current that are underway (not planned – see Criterion 10) and their expected changes to program productivity.

University of Guelph

Program Information Request Form

7. Revenue and Other Resources Generated by the Program Weighting: 8 Points - Word Limit: 300

Revenue and Other Resources Generated under the Program: In this round of PPP, while many programs generate revenue from enrollments and grants (through degree credit or diploma programs) these revenues will not be recognized by program. This criterion attempts to quantify the contribution to a unit's overall fiscal status from revenues or external recoveries that form part of the program's current base budget. (Internal charges to other departments or charges to other funds within the University are NOT Revenues and must be recorded under the criterion 8). For revenues to be recorded in this criterion, they must be in the current base budget of the program costs and NOT notionally associated with it and recorded in some other departments somewhere else. Examples in this category will be mainly the sale of goods and services. In colleges the indirect cost recoveries (research) allocated and Guelph-Humber revenues should be included in this category if they form part of the program's current base budget. "Restricted Revenues" are those received from external funding sources targeted for specific programs deliverables. An example could be fund raising or provincial grants allocated for a specific program (typically on-going in nature In terms of data, the only source of data are those revenues (and external recoveries) that the program currently attracts and are recorded (in the University's FRS – Financial Report System) to the base budget of the program.

Table A: Departmental Unrestricted Revenues Typically revenues raised through the charges for the delivery of services. There are no formal external restrictions on these funds and they may be used to support any type of expense.		
Source/Type	Base Budget	Notes: Include any specific use for the funds other than general program support and any policy or directive specific to the raising of these funds.
Total	\$0.00	

University of Guelph

Program Information Request Form

Table B: Departmental Restricted Revenues Typically funds received that are restricted by an outside policy/directive to specific incremental costs of program		
Source/Type	Base Budget	Notes: Describe program deliverable and expected duration of the source/type.
Total	\$0.00	

Note: Totals from Table A + Table B should equal Total Revenues in Criterion #8, Question #3

Provide the major goals or rationale for the Program raising these revenues including answering how the activity of raising revenue fits with the objectives of the program.

What are the key threats to the continuation of this revenue source(s), how sustainable is it? How would losing some or all of it impact the program?

University of Guelph

Program Information Request Form

8. Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program Weighting: 10 Points - Word Limit: 500

Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program: *This section, while mainly quantitative in nature also provides the opportunity to present further descriptive comments on the costs of the program. This criterion, to the extent possible, should reflect both the direct costs associated with delivering the program but also those other resources that currently, are required to deliver the program. Responses can include in-kind estimates or examples of resources that may not be readily measured but have "costs". Much of this data will need to be disaggregated to the program/service level from current unit budgets and other verifiable information sources.*

1. What are the functions associated with each of the major groupings of positions assigned to the program? In cases where there are large groups or individuals performing a single function, they may be grouped into a single (Position Title). The objective of this section is to describe the key functions of all major groupings of staff – and if possible where unique, those of individual positions. For faculty positions, it is an opportunity to describe the major roles and responsibilities under the specific program.

Position Category /Description	FTE's	Major Functions

University of Guelph

Program Information Request Form

2. **Instructional Programs:** For this category of programs, it is not feasible to assign costs by type (e.g., faculty, staff, operating etc.). For all instructional programs, first the costs for each of the undergraduate or graduate instructional costs of the department are determined. These two “pools” of costs are then allocated to all of the instructional programs supported by that department. For undergraduate programs, the undergraduate cost “pool” will be divided by the total undergraduate course enrolments and in the case of graduate programs, the graduate cost “pool” is divided by the graduate student FTE’s. This step, for both undergraduate and graduate programs is done by the Resource Planning and Analysis (RPA) department and will be provided to the instructional program “author” once RPA has received the two cost “pool” data from instructional departments.

Assigned Instructional Program Costs		
Contributing Department	Course enrolments for Undergraduate or FTE's for Graduate programs	Total Cost
Total	0,000	\$0.00

University of Guelph
Program Information Request Form

3. Non Instructional Programs: What are the direct budgeted costs, associated with delivering the program? (on the following worksheet). Source for this data must be from the program's current base budget.

	Amount	FTEs	Notes
Personnel			
Established Positions			
Faculty			
Other Academic			
P&M			
Staff			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temp Salaries			
Other Academic			
P&M			
Staff			
GTA			
Other			
Benefits			
Total Personnel	\$0.00		
Operating			
Travel			
Equipment > \$5K			
Transfers			
Capital			
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$0.00		
Internal Charges			
Internal Recoveries			
Total Revenues Total from Table A and Table B from Criterion #7 must be equal to amount reported here			
NET BASE BUDGET	\$0.00	0.00	

University of Guelph

Program Information Request Form

4. In addition to the direct costs of the program, are there significant other resource costs of the program that are critical and unusual, required to ensure the program can function e.g. specialized support services?

5. Estimate whether the program manages to operate within total budget or if there is overspending. (It is not necessary to provide historical program results at this time.) Make an evaluation. To what can any over- or under- expenditures be attributed?

6. For Internal Costs Recoveries provide history, policy or approvals and provide a rationale for continuing the practice by the University.

7. Provide a comment on some of the challenges, trends and/or risk in the major cost components of the program. This may include other critical (unique) resource requirements, any major dependencies, risks the program has and whether there are mitigating strategies in place.

Please attach an Organizational Chart if applicable

University of Guelph

Program Information Request Form

9. Impact, Justification and Overall Essentiality of the Program Weighting: 15 Points - Word Limit: 700

***Impact, Justification, and Overall Essentiality of the Program:** This criterion may be said to measure the summative effect of all other criteria: given the information presented in the eight preceding categories, what are the benefits to the college in offering the program? What role does it play in achievement of the mission of the University? How essential is the program to the institution? In this section it is important to map on to the University's current Integrated Plan (IP) as much as possible. This criterion also provides an opportunity to record any relevant program information not already inventoried.*

Consider how this program/service:

Enhances Reputation	
Supports IP's Strategic Focus and Goals	
Supports External Regulatory Requirements	
Other Areas specific to the University's Mission	

University of Guelph

Program Information Request Form

10. Opportunity Analysis of the Program Weighting: 5 Points - Word Limit: 500

***Opportunity Analysis of the Program:** The first criterion concerns the past of the program, while the last concerns its future. This criterion seeks to evaluate the program potential and opportunities by answering questions such as: What program improvements do the faculty and staff recommend? What external factors might positively influence the future of the program? Are there opportunities to collaborate with other programs or institutions? Are there opportunities for outsourcing the program with an operational/fiscal advantage?*

1. What opportunities exist to strengthen this program/service, division in the context of its contributions to the University's mission and goals?
2. What opportunities exist for greater collaboration and team approaches in the delivery of this program/service, either inside or outside your immediate unit/program?
3. What processes could be streamlined, eliminated or added (such as technological improvements) to this program/service to improve efficiency and what measurable improvements would you expect if you implemented these changes? If none, please explain.

9. Appendix B: Rubric

University of Guelph

PPP PIR-Form Rubric

Feb 4, 2013

CRITERION	Doesn't Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
1 History and Development Weight of 5 points	History of is not clearly explained. There is little or no rationale for or expectations of the program/service, why it was created or how it has developed.	Historical rationale and major expectations are provided. There is acknowledgement that the program/service has developed over time with adaptations to changing expectations.	Historical rationale and expectations are clearly explained. Also there is excellent evidence that it has continued to evolve to meet changing expectations.
2 External Demand Weight of 10 points	There is no evidence of external demand or the lack of demand is not explained. External demand for the program/service is very limited; its trend line is flat or declining. There are questions about its efficacy and relevance to any external clients.	There is good evidence of identified external clients/demand. Demand for the program/service is moderate, e.g., current demand is met, and there is a stable trend. There is good evidence of future stable demand and there is potential for future demand continuing or moderately increasing.	Demand/clients for the program/service are clearly defined and exceptional; it enjoys a positive trend line; It serves a large number of students/users/clients and meets a variety of external demand/client expectations, and is seen as central to the University's future.
3 Internal Demand Weight of 10 points	There is no evidence of internal demand or the lack of demand is not explained. Internal demand for the program/service is very limited; its trend line is flat or declining. There are questions about its efficacy and relevance to any internal clients.	There is clear identification of internal clients/demand. It serves a moderate number of students/users/clients e.g., current demand is met, and there is a stable trend. There is good evidence in support of future stable demand and there is potential for future demand continuing or moderately increasing.	Demand/clients for the program/service are clearly defined and exceptional; it enjoys a positive trend line; it meets a variety of internal service/policy expectations, and is seen as central to the University's future. It serves a large number of students/users/clients and/or a large number of other programs/services which could not flourish without this program/service.

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

University of Guelph

PPP PIR-Form Rubric

Feb 4, 2013

CRITERION	Doesn't Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
4 Quality Inputs Weight of 10 points	There is little evidence provided to support the level of quality of the program/service. Where documented, the overall quality of resources dedicated to this program/service is minimal and may be insufficient to mount the program/service at sustainable levels with acceptable levels of quality.	There is evidence provided to support the level of quality of the program. The overall quality of resources dedicated to this program/service is adequate to mount the program to support demand with moderate to good levels of quality.	There are effective and active measures of quality of inputs e.g. highest level of credentials, resource levels or other definable levels of quality. The overall quality of resources dedicated to this program/service is truly exceptional and stands among the very highest standards.
5 Quality Outcomes Weight of 15 points	There is little evidence provided to support the level of quality of the program. Any measures of quality outcomes are not strong e.g., do not compare well to others.	There is a reasonable and relevant evidence of quality measure and that the program can deliver an acceptable level of quality. Measures of quality outcomes are sufficient to meet the basic objectives of the program/service.	There are exceptional validations of the quality of the program of quality outcomes which are both measureable and unassailable. The program could serve as a model for other programs/services at this and other universities.

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

University of Guelph

PPP PIR-Form Rubric

Feb 4, 2013

CRITERION	Doesn't Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
6 Size, Scope and Productivity Weight of 12 points	<p>There is no evidence provided to support the productivity of the program/service</p> <p>The program/service serves few people or entities; is limited in the range of its content; does not demonstrate a positive return of outputs viz. inputs.</p>	<p>There is moderate evidence of the size, scope and productivity of the program/service. There are quantitative data presented to support a basis for productivity assessment.</p> <p>The program/service serves a moderate number of people or entities; facilitates a moderate range of content; demonstrates a neutral/adequate return of outputs viz. inputs.</p>	<p>The program/service serves an exceptional number/range of people, other program or entities. There are sound and comprehensible measures of productivity.</p> <p>The program/service contributes to a comprehensive range of activities/content. There is an excellent demonstration of positive returns of outputs viz. inputs with evidence of constant improvements/adaptations to opportunities/challenges.</p>
7 Revenue Weight of 8 points	<p>There is little evidence provided to support the reasons for or the levels of revenues under program. There is no clear linkage between the source of the revenue and the program.</p> <p>Program/service generates revenue that is under targets or at serious risk of declining</p>	<p>A program has no direct revenue and has no capacity/authority to raise revenue.</p> <p>Or;</p> <p>There is a clear association between the revenue source and the program outcomes e.g., fee for services support the program outcomes/objectives.</p> <p>There is a documented policy for the revenue and threats are moderate in terms of sustainability and matching with expense growth (e.g., ability to adjust with expense growth).</p>	<p>There is a direct association between the revenue source and the program outcomes e.g., fee for services support the program outcomes/objectives.</p> <p>Program/service generates exceptional revenue relative to its costs and is sufficient to sustain the program.</p> <p>The risk to revenue growth is manageable or minimal and strategies can be made to adjust to any revenue volatility.</p>

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

University of Guelph

PPP PIR-Form Rubric

Feb 4, 2013

CRITERION	Doesn't Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
8 Costs Weight of 10 points	<p>There is an unclear or incomplete presentation of costs of the program.</p> <p>Cost components appear high and there are major requirements or dependencies on other programs/services/facilities required to deliver the program/service.</p> <p>Program/service costs exceed those for similar programs/services (where verifiable data is available).</p>	<p>There is a complete presentation of costs and recoveries. The costs seem moderate, are managed within resources provided and there are no major demands made on other programs/services/facilities.</p> <p>Any recoveries are supported under policy/institutional rationale.</p> <p>Program/service costs are in line with expected norms for similar programs (where verifiable data is available).</p>	<p>The Program/Service has demonstrated excellence in cost control e.g., clear processes and policies in place to manage costs and support any cost recoveries.</p> <p>Program/service costs are substantially lower than the norms for similar programs (where verifiable data is available).</p>
9 Impact, Justification and Essentiality Weight of 15 points	<p>There is minimal evidence that the program/service supports the mission of the University, enhances its reputation or contributes to meeting the goals of IP. The essentiality of the program/service is not apparent or is minimal.</p>	<p>There is good evidence that the program/service is supports the mission of the University, enhances its reputation or contributes to meeting the goals of IP.</p> <p>A level of essentiality is defined and the program/service can be linked to the achievement of IP goals.</p>	<p>There is exceptional evidence that suggests that the program/service is integral to enhancing the University's reputation and meeting both its strategic and IP goals.</p> <p>The program/service is clearly essential for the University to achieve its mission and its outcomes map on to IP goals by directly contributing to their achievement.</p>

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

University of Guelph

PPP PIR-Form Rubric

Feb 4, 2013

CRITERION	Doesn't Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
10 Opportunity Analysis Weight of 5 points	There is an unclear or incomplete presentation of any opportunities. Any opportunities for the future of the program/service are unknown, unclear or tenuous; additional resources may be needed to maintain this program.	Opportunities identified for the future of this program/service indicate a moderate potential for improvement. There is a good case made the opportunities are possible and clearly would enhance the program/service outcomes.	Opportunities for the future of this program/service are exciting and hold great promise. An excellent case is made that clearly would enhance the program/service and/or contribute to the success or enhancement of other programs/services in the University.

10. Appendix C: Task Force Terms of Reference

University of Guelph Program Prioritization Process

Task Force Terms of Reference

Brief Description

The scoring of Program Information Request forms will be carried out by the Program Prioritization Process Task Force. The Task Force of 21 University community members have been divided into 4 sub-groups and each sub-group will be randomly assigned PIR templates to review and score. In the execution of their duties, the Task Force (and associated sub-groups) will conduct their business in accordance with these Terms of Reference.

1.0 Roles

Members of the sub-groups will assume various roles in the template review process.

1. Leader/Facilitator – responsible for setting up meetings, communicating with the Chair and Vice-Chair of task force, and facilitating the discussion throughout the deliberations
2. Primary Reader – responsible for thoroughly reviewing the template, leading the discussion within the sub-group, providing relevant details to support findings.
3. Secondary Reader – responsible for thoroughly reviewing the template, and contributing relevant details to support findings.
4. Scribe – responsible for documenting salient points of discussion and inputting points, comments, and final scores into database.
5. Time keeper – responsible for ensuring that the sub-group's work is done in accordance with the time allotted.

2.0 Norms

2.0 Charter

Task Force members are expected to adhere to the Charter found at:
<https://www.uoguelph.ca/vpacademic/ppp/task-force>

2.1 Meeting

- a. Be on time, stay on time, end on time, manage overall timing of process
- b. If decided to be of value to the sub-group, use agenda, distribute agenda in a timely fashion
- c. Establish clear goals, purpose, action items, milestones
- d. Assign a leader/facilitator and other defined roles
- e. Set up meeting configuration for optimal participation

2.2 Behaviour

- f. Participate actively and valuably, formulate thoughts before speaking, be equitable
- g. Maintain tone of calm, courtesy, speaking the way you would want to be spoken to, keep it light (fun and humour)
- h. Prepare!
- i. Seek/be receptive to new ideas and information, overcome biases
- j. Stay focused on the goal and agenda. Aware of progress of meeting.
- k. Listen actively
- l. Be present

3.0 Decision Making

3.1 Process

Decisions concerning process will be brought to the Task Force for discussion and vote. A two-thirds majority (of those present) is required for the motion to pass.

Minor or 'house-keeping' process items will be decided by the Task Force Chairs.

3.2 Content

Task force members will use the scoring regime to score each criterion on the PIR Form. Sub-group deliberation decisions will be made by consensus. If the sub-group cannot reach consensus on a criterion after sufficient discussion, the sub-group will vote and majority will rule.

Protocols for process and content will be brought to the Management Team for consultation and approval by the Task Force Chairs. This is to ensure that both groups are acting in accordance with the mandate of PPP.

4.0 Conflict of Interest

Faculty, staff and student members of the Task Force are all members of Departments or Units that are under review during PPP. As such, it is natural for conflicts of interest (real or perceived) to arise. The following set of conditions will provide Task Force members with guidelines to define a conflict of interest.

It is expected that Task Force members will review and score PIR Forms from their College/Division and will do so with objectivity and neutrality. However, Task Force members will recuse themselves from deliberations on PIR Forms that meet any one of the following conditions:

1. Task Force member is a member or cross appointee to a Department or Unit
2. Task Force member has an immediate family member or partner working in the Department or Unit

5.0 Confidentiality

Confidentiality is mandatory, both during this process, and for all time after it has concluded. If there is any doubt at any time about what is permissible within the bounds of confidentiality, members must speak with the Task Force Chairs before acting. All Task Force business must be kept strictly confidential. This includes a prohibition of discussion at any time, with anyone other than another committee member about anything that takes place in the smaller committee or larger Task Force meetings.

Task Force members may be questioned or lobbied by others about the process or outcomes of the process. While the process is transparent, the discussions, decisions and outcomes are not to be shared by Task Force members with individuals outside of the Task Force. Members of the University Community must be reminded to visit the website for updates.

Task Force members each agree to hold in complete confidence all information (ie., notes, comments, ratings, discussions) provided to them or created by the Task Force and they each will not use, discuss or disclose any information to any person, group or entity on their own initiative. They each agree that all communication on behalf of the committee will be through the Chair and/or Vice-Chair or Provost.

Task Force members each agree to protect and not to share with any other person written material (in either print or electronic form) received or created in conjunction with PPP. This is especially important for scores and comments developed by the Committees or Task Force.

If questions arise around content contained in the PIR form, please direct the questions to the Task Force Chairs. All queries or questions posed to Dean's or PIR form authors etc. will be done by the Task Force chairs.

Task Force members agree to keep all materials safe and acknowledge that these materials cannot be stored in meeting rooms for security purposes.

6.0 Communication

From time to time, the Task Force will want to communicate information to the broader University Community. Such communication will be drafted by the Task Force Chairs and will be vetted and approved by the Task Force members. The communication will then be sent to the Provost by the Chairs who will then coordinate the dissemination.

It is expected that Task Force members will be communicating amongst the membership. Given the confidential nature of the work, Task Force

members will only communicate logistical information electronically. Comments and perspectives on various templates will not be shared via email and will only be communicated during deliberations.

7.0 Process

7.1 Norming

It is important that the evaluation process be consistent from group to group and over the period of a group's work. Although the consultants did not see this as a potential problem, it is important that we take steps to assure the University Community that the process is consistent. This can be achieved by having groups rate the same PIR Form weekly for an initial few weeks of the review process. The average scores across groups and overtime can be tracked to measure inter rater reliability.

7.2 Written Comments

The comments recorded for each PIR Form are a critical part of the review process. While the scores generated by the review process are meant to be deleted after the review is complete, the comments will live on. The comments will be important to help explain and reflect the outcome for each PIR Form. The comments should capture/include highlights and lowlights, interconnectivity between programs, opportunities that are captured by the authors or discovered by the Task Force members. They will be used to demonstrate trends etc. The comments can be short concise bullet points.

7.3 Timing

It is expected that all sub-groups progress at a similar pace during the first 6 weeks of the review. This will ensure that the sub-groups learn and develop expertise around the process at a consistent rate. Beyond the 6 weeks, sub-groups are expected to meet the minimum required review (13 PIR forms per week) and may progress more quickly if all members agree to

the schedule. To allow for unforeseen circumstances it is highly recommended that each group review an additional 1 – 2 PIR Forms per week. This will allow for additional time during the final stages of review.

Al Sullivan
Michelle Fach

11. Appendix D: Rankings

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

Ranking	PIR Form Programs	Program Identifier	Department Name	Author	Submitter
Q1	ABIO-Ma	ABIO-Ma	ANIMAL & POULTRY SCIENCE	Gregoy Bedecarrats	Robert Gordon
	Advancement Support Services	0391XX1260	VP AA&D	Paul Hossie	Alastair Summerlee
	AHN-Ma	AHN-Ma	FAMILY RELATIONS & APPLIED NUTRITION	Michael Nightingale	Kerry Daly
	Annual Giving and Alumni Relations	0391XX1290	VP AA&D	Kathy Wilson	Alastair Summerlee
	Arboretum	0136XX590	ARBORETUM	Jonathan Schmidt	Robert Gordon
	Athletic Marketing	0042XX870	ATHLETICS	Tom Kendall	Brenda Whiteside
	BCH	BCH	SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE (SOCS)	Stefan Kremer	Anthony Vannelli
	Biodiversity Institute	0600XX570	BIODIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF ONTARIO	Paul Hebert	Michael Emes
	BIOE-Ma	BIOE-Ma	SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING	Hussein Abdullah	Anthony Vannelli
	BIOM-Ma	BIOM-Ma	HUMAN HEALTH AND NUTRITIONAL SCI	Lawrence Spriet	Michael Emes
	BIOP-Ma	BIOP-Ma	PHYSICS	Eric Poisson	Anthony Vannelli
	BLA	BLA	SCHOOL OF ENV. DESIGN & RURAL DEV	Wayne Caldwell	Robert Gordon
	BSCH.BIOS-Ma	BSCH.BIOS-Ma	DEAN - BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE	Brian Husband	Michael Emes
	Camps & Community Leagues	0042XX860	ATHLETICS	Tom Kendall	Brenda Whiteside
	Career Advising	0114XX680	CO-OP EDUCATION & CAREER SERVICES	Karen Reimer	Brenda Whiteside
	CENG-Ma	CENG-Ma	SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING	Hussein Abdullah	Anthony Vannelli
	Centre for Families, Work and Well Being	0250XX592	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Belinda Leach	Kerry Daly
	Centre for Students with Disabilities	0534XX930	CENTRE FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	Bruno Mancini	Brenda Whiteside
	Child Care Services	0339XX421	CHILD CARE OPERATIONS	Lorna Reid	Brenda Whiteside
	Civic Engagement	0530XX740	STUDENT LIFE	Laurie Schnarr	Brenda Whiteside
	Classroom Technical Support	0054XX400	CLASSROOM TECHNICAL SUPPORT	Michelle Fach	Serge Desmarais
	College and Division Administrative Services	0101XX1500	DEAN - OAC	Laurie Halfpenny-Mitchell	Robert Gordon
	College and Division Administrative Services	0158XX1500	DEAN - BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE	Michael Emes	Michael Emes
	College and Division Administrative Services - Ridgetown	0465XX1500	RIDGETOWN ADMINISTRATION	Ken McEwan	Robert Gordon
	College and Division ITC Support	0401XX1200	LIBRARY INFO TECHNOLOGY SERVICES	Catherine Steeves	Rebecca Graham
	Convocation	0370XX310	CONVOCATION FUND	Claire Alexander	Alastair Summerlee
	Donor Stewardship	0391XX1310	VP AA&D	Wendy Turner	Alastair Summerlee
	DVT	0462XXDVT	RIDGETOWN ACADEMIC	Ken McEwan	Robert Gordon
	Educational and Curriculum Development	0449XX420	EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT	Michelle Fach	Serge Desmarais
	Electrochemical Technology Center	0590XX590	ELECTROCHEMICAL TECHNOLOGY CENTER	Paul Rowntree	Anthony Vannelli
	Employee and Labour Relations	0060XX1400	HUMAN RESOURCES	Brenda Rantz	Martha Harley
	ENVE-Ma	ENVE-Ma	SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING	Hussein Abdullah	Anthony Vannelli
	Environmental Health and Safety	0060XX1411	HUMAN RESOURCES	Christi Cooper	Martha Harley
	Executive Management and Administration	0002XX1320	EXECUTIVE OFFICES	Maureen Mancuso	Alastair Summerlee
	Fitness & Recreation	0042XX800	ATHLETICS	Tom Kendall	Brenda Whiteside
	Food Services	0014XX1030	HOSPITALITY SERVICES	Ed Townsley	David Boeckner
	FOOD-Ma	FOOD-Ma	FOOD SCIENCE	Art Hill	Robert Gordon
	Government Loans and Grants (OSAP/US Loans)	0443XX270	STUDENT FINANCIAL SERVICES	Manny Sheehy	Brian Pettigrew
	Guelph Turfgrass Institute	0113XX590	PLANT AGRICULTURE	Robert Witherspoon	Robert Gordon
	Health and Performance Centre	0178XX710	HEALTH & PERFORMANCE CENTRE	Brenda Whiteside	Brenda Whiteside

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

Ranking	PIR Form Programs	Program Identifier	Department Name	Author	Submitter
Q1	HK-Ma	HK-Ma	HUMAN HEALTH AND NUTRITIONAL SCI	Lawrence Spriet	Michael Emes
	Institute for Comparative Cancer Investigations	0247XX590	INSTITUTE FOR COMPARATIVE CANCER INVESTIGA	Gord Kirby	Elizabeth Stone
	International Programs	0568XX425	CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS	Serge Desmarais	Serge Desmarais
	Intramurals	0042XX830	ATHLETICS	Tom Kendall	Brenda Whiteside
	Learning Commons	0400XX360	CHIEF LIBRARIAN'S OFFICE	Catherine Steeves	Rebecca Graham
	Librarian Scholarship and Service	0400XX170	CHIEF LIBRARIAN'S OFFICE	Catherine Steeves	Rebecca Graham
	Library Information Resources	0326XX670	LIBRARY COLLECTION ACQUISITIONS	Scott Gillies	Rebecca Graham
	Major and Planned Gifts	0391XX1300	VP AA&D	Audrey Jamal	Alastair Summerlee
	MBG-Ma	MBG-Ma	MOLECULAR & CELLULAR BIOLOGY	Chris Whitfield	Michael Emes
	MECH-Ma	MECH-Ma	SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING	Hussein Abdullah	Anthony Vannelli
	MEF-Ma	MEF-Ma	ECONOMICS & FINANCE	Stephen Kosempel	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	MFA.CW	MFA.CW	SCHOOL OF ENGLISH AND THEATRE STUDIES	Alan Filewod	Donald Bruce
	MICR-Ma	MICR-Ma	MOLECULAR & CELLULAR BIOLOGY	Chris Whitfield	Michael Emes
	MPH.PHLT	MPH.PHLT	POPULATION MEDICINE	Cate Dewey	Elizabeth Stone
	MSC.CDE	MSC.CDE	SCHOOL OF ENV. DESIGN & RURAL DEV	Al Lauzon	Robert Gordon
	MSC.ENVS	MSC.ENVS	ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES	Jonathan Newman	Robert Gordon
	MSC.FARE	MSC.FARE	FOOD AGRICULTURAL AND RESOURCE ECONOMICS	John Cranfield	Robert Gordon
	MSC.FOOD	MSC.FOOD	FOOD SCIENCE	Loong-Tak Lim	Robert Gordon
	MSC.FRAN-CFT	MSC.FRAN-CFT	FAMILY RELATIONS & APPLIED NUTRITION	Michael Nightingale	Kerry Daly
	MSC.IBIO	MSC.IBIO	INTEGRATIVE BIOLOGY	Teri Crease	Michael Emes
	MSPL.RPD	MSPL.RPD	SCHOOL OF ENV. DESIGN & RURAL DEV	Harry Cummings	Robert Gordon
	New Student Programming	0530XX750	STUDENT LIFE	Laurie Schnarr	Brenda Whiteside
	Non Degree Learning	0025XX430	CONTINUING EDUCATION/OPEN LEARNING PGM	Michelle Fach	Serge Desmarais
	Parking and Transportation Services	0023XX1700	PARKING ADMINISTRATION	Ian Weir	Robin Begin
	Personal Counselling	0533XX890	COUNSELLING	Bruno Mancini	Brenda Whiteside
	PHD.ENVS	PHD.ENVS	ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES	Jonathan Newman	Robert Gordon
	PHD.HHNS	PHD.HHNS	HUMAN HEALTH AND NUTRITIONAL SCI	Coral Murrant	Michael Emes
	PHD.MCB	PHD.MCB	MOLECULAR & CELLULAR BIOLOGY	Chris Whitfield	Michael Emes
	Primary Care	0078XX700	STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES	Lynda Davenport	Brenda Whiteside
	Procurement to Pay	0010XX1440	ASST VP FINANCIAL SERVICES	Ray Pero	John Miles
	Research - ANIMAL & POULTRY SCIENCE	0108XX150	ANIMAL & POULTRY SCIENCE	Kees de Lange	Robert Gordon
	Research - ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES	0131XX150	ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES	Jonathan Newman	Robert Gordon
	Research - FOOD SCIENCE	0123XX150	FOOD SCIENCE	Milena Corridig	Robert Gordon
	Research - INTEGRATIVE BIOLOGY	0146XX150	INTEGRATIVE BIOLOGY	Maira Ferguson	Michael Emes
	Research - MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS	0288XX150	MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS	David Kribs	Anthony Vannelli
	Research - MOLECULAR & CELLULAR BIOLOGY	0144XX150	MOLECULAR & CELLULAR BIOLOGY	Chris Whitfield	Michael Emes
	Research - PHYSICS	0285XX150	PHYSICS	Eric Poisson	Anthony Vannelli
	Research - PLANT AGRICULTURE	0128XX150	PLANT AGRICULTURE	Peter Pauls	Robert Gordon
	Research - POPULATION MEDICINE	0243XX150	POPULATION MEDICINE	Cate Dewey	Elizabeth Stone
	Research - RIDGETOWN ACADEMIC	0462XX150	RIDGETOWN ACADEMIC	Ken McEwan	Robert Gordon

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

Ranking	PIR Form Programs	Program Identifier	Department Name	Author	Submitter
Q1	Research - SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING	0126XX150	SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING	Hussein Abdullah	Anthony Vannelli
	Research - SCHOOL OF ENGLISH AND THEATRE STUDIES	0269XX150	SCHOOL OF ENGLISH AND THEATRE STUDIES	Alan Filewod	Donald Bruce
	Research Ethics, Legal, and Risk Management	0545XX471	AVP RESEARCH	John Livernois	Kevin Hall
	Retail Outlets	0014XX1060	HOSPITALITY SERVICES	Ed Townsley	David Boeckner
	Senior Management and Planning	0101XX1490	DEAN - OAC	Rene Van Acker	Robert Gordon
	Senior Management and Planning	0195XX1490	CME DEAN'S OFFICE	Julia Christensen-Hughes	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	Senior Management and Planning	0400XX1490	CHIEF LIBRARIAN'S OFFICE	Catherine Steeves	Rebecca Graham
	Service	0101XX160	DEAN - OAC	Beverly Hale	Robert Gordon
	Service	0158XX160	DEAN - BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE	Michael Emes	Michael Emes
	Specific Enterprise Applications (Tier I)	0062XX1160	CCS - OPERATING	Kent Hoeg	Rebecca Graham
	Student Business	0443XX250	STUDENT FINANCIAL SERVICES	Manny Sheehy	Brian Pettigrew
	Student Financial Aid and Scholarships	0443XX260	STUDENT FINANCIAL SERVICES	Manny Sheehy	Brian Pettigrew
	Treasury and Investment Operations	0010XX1450	ASST VP FINANCIAL SERVICES	Glenn White	John Miles
	Tri University Group (TUG)	0524XX600	LIBRARY TRI-UNIVERSITY GROUP	Scott Gillies	Rebecca Graham
	Undergraduate Residences	0013XX1000	HOUSING SERVICES	Irene Thompson	Brenda Whiteside
	Workforce Planning, Recruitment, and Performance	0060XX1380	HUMAN RESOURCES	Linda Watt	Martha Harley
	ZOO-Ma	ZOO-Ma	INTEGRATIVE BIOLOGY	Moir Ferguson	Michael Emes
Q1 Total		97			

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

Ranking	PIR Form Programs	Program Identifier	Department Name	Author	Submitter
Q2	Academic Program Counselling	0101XX422	DEAN - OAC	Jonathan Schmidt	Robert Gordon
	Academic Services	0440XX280	ACADEMIC RECORDS	Sharon Anthony	Brian Pettigrew
	ACCT-Ma	ACCT-Ma	BUSINESS	Davar Rezanian	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	ADEV-Ma	ADEV-Ma	FAMILY RELATIONS & APPLIED NUTRITION	Michael Nightingale	Kerry Daly
	Archival and Special Collections	0400XX610	CHIEF LIBRARIAN'S OFFICE	Kathryn Harvey	Rebecca Graham
	Athletic Facilities	0042XX880	ATHLETICS	Tom Kendall	Brenda Whiteside
	BAG.SOC	BAG.SOC	SOCIOLOGY & ANTHROPOLOGY	Patrick Parnaby	Kerry Daly
	BIOC-Ma	BIOC-Ma	MOLECULAR & CELLULAR BIOLOGY	Chris Whitfield	Michael Emes
	BME-Ma	BME-Ma	SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING	Hussein Abdullah	Anthony Vannelli
	BPCH-Ma	BPCH-Ma	CHEMISTRY	Dan Thomas	Anthony Vannelli
	BSCG.BIOS	BSCG.BIOS	DEAN - BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE	Brian Husband	Michael Emes
	Budgeting and Planning	0010XX1420	ASST VP FINANCIAL SERVICES	Larry Shuh	John Miles
	Central Utilities Plant Operation	0826XX1530	CENTRAL UTILITIES PLANT-OP COSTS	Steve Nyman	Bob Carter
	Centre for Public Health and Zoonoses	0246XX590	CENTRE FOR PUBLIC HEALTH	Gord Kirby	Elizabeth Stone
	College and Division Administrative Services	0250XX1500	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Kerry Daly	Kerry Daly
	College and Division ITC Support	0250XX1200	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Scott Shaw	Kerry Daly
	Commercialization and Technology Transfer	0543XX520	CATALYST CENTRE	Erin Skimson	Kevin Hall
	Communications and Public Affairs	0390XX1220	COMMUNICATIONS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS	Charles Cunningham	Alastair Summerlee
	Construction and Renovation	0806XX1690	PLANNING, ENGINEERING & CONSTRUCTION	Dan MacLachlan	Bob Carter
	Co-operative Educational Services	0114XX450	CO-OP EDUCATION & CAREER SERVICES	Karen Reimer	Brenda Whiteside
	Custodial	0846XX1590	HOUSEKEEPING	Ed Martin	Bob Carter
	Customer Service Support	0062XX1110	CCS - OPERATING	Brian Thompson	Rebecca Graham
	CYF-Ma	CYF-Ma	FAMILY RELATIONS & APPLIED NUTRITION	Michael Nightingale	Kerry Daly
	Databases and Enterprise Access Services	0062XX1140	CCS - OPERATING	Brian Thompson	Rebecca Graham
	Distance Education and Open Learning	0081XX440	DISTANCE EDUCATION	Michelle Fach	Serge Desmarais
	DTM	DTM	PLANT AGRICULTURE	Peter Pauls	Robert Gordon
	DVM	DVM	DEAN - OVC	Stephanie Nykamp	Elizabeth Stone
	DVSC.POPM+VETS	DVSC.POPM+VETS	POPULATION MEDICINE	Cate Dewey	Elizabeth Stone
	ENVB-Ma	ENVB-Ma	ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES	Jonathan Newman	Robert Gordon
	ENVE-Mi	ENVE-Mi	SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING	Hussein Abdullah	Anthony Vannelli
	ENVS-Ma	ENVS-Ma	ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES	Jonathan Newman	Robert Gordon
	Equine Guelph	0222XX590	OVC EQUINE GUELPH	Gord Kirby	Elizabeth Stone
	ESC-Ma	ESC-Ma	SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING	Hussein Abdullah	Anthony Vannelli
	EURS-Ma	EURS-Ma	DEAN - ARTS	Clive Thomson	Donald Bruce
	Exam Centre	0077XX665	STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES	Bruno Mancini	Brenda Whiteside
	Faculty and Academic Staff Relations	0002XX1402	EXECUTIVE OFFICES	Tracey Jandrisits	Alastair Summerlee
	Family Housing	0013XX1020	HOUSING SERVICES	Irene Thompson	Brenda Whiteside
	Fire Prevention	0857XX1731	FIRE PREVENTION	Robin Begin	Robin Begin
	General Maintenance	0810XX1570	CENTRAL UTILITIES PLANT-OP COSTS	Steve Nyman	Bob Carter
	GH Kinesiology	0299XX100	HUMAN HEALTH AND NUTRITIONAL SCI	Lawrence Spriet	Michael Emes

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

Ranking	PIR Form Programs	Program Identifier	Department Name	Author	Submitter
Q2	Governance Services	0017XX1330	UNIVERSITY SECRETARIAT	Vicki Hodgkinson	Alastair Summerlee
	Graduate Support Services	0456XX173	GRADUATE STUDIES	Pauline Sinclair	Anthony Clarke
	Grounds Services	0862XX1600	GROUND	Ed Martin	Bob Carter
	Guelph Humber Finance and Administration	0539XX3060	GUELPH HUMBER PROGRAMS	George Bragues	George Bragues
	Guelph Humber Human Services	0539XX3005	GUELPH HUMBER PROGRAMS	George Bragues	George Bragues
	Guelph Humber ITC	0539XX3055	GUELPH HUMBER PROGRAMS	George Bragues	George Bragues
	Guelph Humber Kinesiology	0539XX3020	GUELPH HUMBER PROGRAMS	George Bragues	George Bragues
	Guelph Humber Recruitment and Admissions	0539XX3040	GUELPH HUMBER PROGRAMS	George Bragues	George Bragues
	HAFA-Ma	HAFA-Ma	SCHOOL OF HOSPITALITY & TOURISM MGT.	Kerry Godfrey	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	ID Cards	0440XX300	ACADEMIC RECORDS	Sharon Anthony	Brian Pettigrew
	Intercultural Programming	0530XX940	STUDENT LIFE	Laurie Schnarr	Brenda Whiteside
	International Students (high school and transfers)	0442XX230	ADMISSIONS	Deanna Plexman	Brian Pettigrew
	MA.ECON	MA.ECON	ECONOMICS & FINANCE	Stephen Kosempel	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	MA.LEAD	MA.LEAD	EXECUTIVE PROGRAMS	Sylvain Charlebois	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	MAN.FRAN	MAN.FRAN	FAMILY RELATIONS & APPLIED NUTRITION	Michael Nightingale	Kerry Daly
	MBA.DBA-FABM	MBA.DBA-FABM	MBA PROGRAMS	Sylvain Charlebois	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	MBA.DBA-HTM	MBA.DBA-HTM	MBA PROGRAMS	Sylvain Charlebois	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	MFB-Ma	MFB-Ma	INTEGRATIVE BIOLOGY	Moir Ferguson	Michael Emes
	MICR-Mi	MICR-Mi	MOLECULAR & CELLULAR BIOLOGY	Chris Whitfield	Michael Emes
	MLA	MLA	SCHOOL OF ENV. DESIGN & RURAL DEV	Karen Landman	Robert Gordon
	MSC.+TOX	MSC.+TOX	CHEMISTRY	Richard Manderville	Anthony Vannelli
	MSC.APS	MSC.APS	ANIMAL & POULTRY SCIENCE	John Cant	Robert Gordon
	MSC.CHEM	MSC.CHEM	CHEMISTRY	Dan Thomas	Anthony Vannelli
	MSC.MASC.ENGG	MSC.MASC.ENGG	SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING	Doug Joy	Anthony Vannelli
	MSC.MCB	MSC.MCB	MOLECULAR & CELLULAR BIOLOGY	Chris Whitfield	Michael Emes
	MSC.MCS	MSC.MCS	MARKETING AND CONSUMER STUDIES	Vinay Kanetkar	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	MSC.PLNT	MSC.PLNT	PLANT AGRICULTURE	Barry Shelp	Robert Gordon
	MSC.PSYC	MSC.PSYC	PSYCHOLOGY	Lana Trick	Kerry Daly
	NANS-Ma	NANS-Ma	HUMAN HEALTH AND NUTRITIONAL SCI	Lawrence Spriet	Michael Emes
	Networking and Data Centre	0062XX1180	CCS - OPERATING	Leon Loo	Rebecca Graham
	NEUR-Mi	NEUR-Mi	DEAN - BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE	Brian Husband	Michael Emes
	Non Credit - RIDGETOWN CONTINUING EDUCATION	0464XX130	RIDGETOWN CONTINUING EDUCATION	Ken McEwan	Robert Gordon
	Occupational Health and Wellness	0060XX1410	HUMAN RESOURCES	Cathy Kannenberg	Martha Harley
	Off-Campus Programming	0530XX1311	STUDENT LIFE	Laurie Schnarr	Brenda Whiteside
	OMAFRA Program Support	0544XX471	OMAFRA RESEARCH STATIONS	Ken Hough	Kevin Hall
	Ontario Secondary Students	0442XX180	ADMISSIONS	Deanna Plexman	Brian Pettigrew
	OVC Health Sciences Centre	0201XX40	OVC HSC COO OFFICE	Sherri Cox	Elizabeth Stone
	PHD.ECON	PHD.ECON	ECONOMICS & FINANCE	Stephen Kosempel	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	PHD.PHYS	PHD.PHYS	PHYSICS	Paul Garrett	Anthony Vannelli
	PHD.RST	PHD.RST	SCHOOL OF ENV. DESIGN & RURAL DEV	John FitzGibbon	Robert Gordon

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

Ranking	PIR Form Programs	Program Identifier	Department Name	Author	Submitter
Q2	PLSC-Ma	PLSC-Ma	PLANT AGRICULTURE	Peter Pauls	Robert Gordon
	Police Services	0854XX1730	CAMPUS COMMUNITY POLICE	Robin Begin	Robin Begin
	POLS-Ma	POLS-Ma	POLITICAL SCIENCE	Byron Sheldrick	Kerry Daly
	PSYC-Ma	PSYC-Ma	PSYCHOLOGY	Mary Ann Evans	Kerry Daly
	Real Estate Management	0303XX1740	REAL ESTATE DIVISION	Philip Wong	Philip Wong
	Research - BIOMEDICAL SCIENCE	0230XX150	BIOMEDICAL SCIENCE	Neil MacLusky	Elizabeth Stone
	Research - GEOGRAPHY	0296XX150	GEOGRAPHY	John Smithers	Kerry Daly
	Research - HISTORY	0270XX150	HISTORY	Peter Goddard	Donald Bruce
	Research - HUMAN HEALTH AND NUTRITIONAL SCI	0299XX150	HUMAN HEALTH AND NUTRITIONAL SCI	Lawrence Spriet	Michael Emes
	Research - SCHOOL OF FINE ART & MUSIC	0267XX150	SCHOOL OF FINE ART & MUSIC	John Kissick	Donald Bruce
	Research Planning and Analysis	0061XX330	RESOURCE PLANNING AND ANALYSIS	Brian Pettigrew	Brian Pettigrew
	Residence Life	0013XX980	HOUSING SERVICES	Irene Thompson	Brenda Whiteside
	Ridgetown Academic Support	0462XX2410	RIDGETOWN ACADEMIC	Ken McEwan	Robert Gordon
	Scheduling Services	0441XX320	SCHEDULES	Tammy Arsenault-Irving	Brian Pettigrew
	Servers, Storage, and Backups	0062XX1190	CCS - OPERATING	Leon Loo	Rebecca Graham
	TMGT-Ma	TMGT-Ma	SCHOOL OF HOSPITALITY & TOURISM MGT.	Kerry Godfrey	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	Total Compensation	0060XX1390	HUMAN RESOURCES	Lillian Wilson	Martha Harley
	Undergraduate Curriculum/UAIC	0331XX420	ASSOCIATE VP ACADEMIC	Serge Desmarais	Serge Desmarais
	University Controllership Services	0010XX1430	ASST VP FINANCIAL SERVICES	Alexa Hinsperger	John Miles
	War Memorial Hall	0490XX1050	WAR MEMORIAL HALL OPERATIONS	Sylvia Williams	David Boeckner
	Wildlife Biology & Conservation	WBC	INTEGRATIVE BIOLOGY	Moir Ferguson	Michael Emes
	WRE-Ma	WRE-Ma	SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING	Hussein Abdullah	Anthony Vannelli
Q2 Total		102			

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

Ranking	PIR Form Programs	Program Identifier	Department Name	Author	Submitter
Q3	Academic Program Counselling	0158XX422	DEAN - BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE	Brian Husband	Michael Emes
	Academic Program Counselling	0195XX422	CME DEAN'S OFFICE	Kerry Godfrey	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	Academic Program Counselling	0253XX422	DEAN CPES	Joseph Cunsolo	Anthony Vannelli
	Academic Support	0439XX290	ACADEMIC PROGRAMS	Sharon Anthony	Brian Pettigrew
	Advanced Analysis Centre	0581XX580	X-RAY DIFFRACTION AND SCATTERING	Glen Van Der Kraak	Kevin Hall
	AGR-Mi	AGR-Mi	DEAN - OAC	Jonathan Schmidt	Robert Gordon
	AGRS-Ma	AGRS-Ma	PLANT AGRICULTURE	Peter Pauls	Robert Gordon
	Alumni and Fundraising	0042XX1310	ATHLETICS	Tom Kendall	Brenda Whiteside
	Animal Regulatory Support	0566XX500	ANIMAL CARE SERVICES	Alec Popovic	Kevin Hall
	ANSC-Ma	ANSC-Ma	ANIMAL & POULTRY SCIENCE	Gregoy Bedecarrats	Robert Gordon
	BAS	BAS	DEAN - ARTS	Ann Wilson	Donald Bruce
	BIOL-Mi	BIOL-Mi	DEAN - BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE	Brian Husband	Michael Emes
	Campbell Centre for the Study of Animal Welfare (CCSAW)	0240XX590	CAMPBELL ANIMAL WELFARE PROGRAM	Gord Kirby	Elizabeth Stone
	CHAT-Ma	CHAT-Ma	PLANT AGRICULTURE	Peter Pauls	Robert Gordon
	CIS-Mi	CIS-Mi	SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE (SOCS)	Stefan Kremer	Anthony Vannelli
	CJPP-Ma	CJPP-Ma	SOCIOLOGY & ANTHROPOLOGY	Patrick Parnaby	Kerry Daly
	College and Division Administrative Services	0195XX1500	CME DEAN'S OFFICE	Heidi Huisman	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	College and Division Administrative Services	0201XX1500	DEAN - OVC	Carol Ann Higgins	Elizabeth Stone
	DAGR - KEMPTVILLE ACADEMIC	0475XXDAGR	KEMPTVILLE ACADEMIC	Claude Naud	Robert Gordon
	DENM	0462XXDENM	RIDGETOWN ACADEMIC	Ken McEwan	Robert Gordon
	Desktop Solutions and Support	0062XX1090	CCS - OPERATING	Brian Thompson	Rebecca Graham
	DHRT	0462XXDHRT	RIDGETOWN ACADEMIC	Ken McEwan	Robert Gordon
	Discovery and Access	0400XX620	CHIEF LIBRARIAN'S OFFICE	Amanda Etches Johnson	Rebecca Graham
	DVSC.CLST+VETS	DVSC.CLST+VETS	CLINICAL STUDIES	Carolyn Kerr	Elizabeth Stone
	DVSC.PABI+VETS	DVSC.PABI+VETS	PATHOBIOLOGY DEPT.	Robert Jacobs	Elizabeth Stone
	ECOL-Mi	ECOL-Mi	INTEGRATIVE BIOLOGY	Moir Ferguson	Michael Emes
	EGOV-Ma	EGOV-Ma	GEOGRAPHY	John Smithers	Kerry Daly
	Employer Programs	0114XX690	CO-OP EDUCATION & CAREER SERVICES	Karen Reimer	Brenda Whiteside
	EQM-Ma	EQM-Ma	ANIMAL & POULTRY SCIENCE	Gregoy Bedecarrats	Robert Gordon
	External and Community Relations	0002XX541	EXECUTIVE OFFICES	Sue Bennett	Alastair Summerlee
	Graduate Financial Aid and Scholarships	0456XX172	GRADUATE STUDIES	Pauline Sinclair	Anthony Clarke
	Guelph Humber Business	0539XX3015	GUELPH HUMBER PROGRAMS	George Bragues	George Bragues
	Guelph Humber Instruction	0195XX60	CME DEAN'S OFFICE	Kerry Godfrey	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	Guelph Humber Justice	0539XX3030	GUELPH HUMBER PROGRAMS	George Bragues	George Bragues
	Guelph Humber Library and Learning	0539XX3045	GUELPH HUMBER PROGRAMS	George Bragues	George Bragues
	Guelph Humber Media	0539XX3010	GUELPH HUMBER PROGRAMS	George Bragues	George Bragues
	HIST-Ma	HIST-Ma	HISTORY	Peter Goddard	Donald Bruce
	HRM-Ma	HRM-Ma	BUSINESS	Davar Rezanian	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	Human Rights and Equity Office	0373XX1340	HUMAN RIGHTS & EQUITY OFFICE	Brenda Whiteside	Alastair Summerlee
	Institute for Community Engaged Scholarship	0250XX591	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Linda Hawkins	Kerry Daly

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

Ranking	PIR Form Programs	Program Identifier	Department Name	Author	Submitter
Q3	Intercollegiate Sports	0042XX770	ATHLETICS	Tom Kendall	Brenda Whiteside
	Internal Audit	0006XX1370	AUDIT SERVICES	Sandra Nervo	Alastair Summerlee
	ITC Governance and Risk Management	0062XX1150	CCS - OPERATING	Doug Badger	Rebecca Graham
	MA.CCJP	MA.CCJP	POLITICAL SCIENCE	Myrna Dawson	Kerry Daly
	MA.ENGL	MA.ENGL	SCHOOL OF ENGLISH AND THEATRE STUDIES	Alan Filewod	Donald Bruce
	MA.GEOG	MA.GEOG	GEOGRAPHY	John Smithers	Kerry Daly
	MA.HIST	MA.HIST	HISTORY	Peter Goddard	Donald Bruce
	MA.PIA	MA.PIA	SOCIOLOGY & ANTHROPOLOGY	Patrick Parnaby	Kerry Daly
	MA.PSYC	MA.PSYC	PSYCHOLOGY	Lana Trick	Kerry Daly
	MATH-Ma	MATH-Ma	MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS	David Kribs	Anthony Vannelli
	MFA.SART	MFA.SART	SCHOOL OF FINE ART & MUSIC	John Kissick	Donald Bruce
	MKMN-Ma	MKMN-Ma	MARKETING AND CONSUMER STUDIES	Vinay Kanetkar	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	MPLAN.RPD	MPLAN.RPD	SCHOOL OF ENV. DESIGN & RURAL DEV	Harry Cummings	Robert Gordon
	MSC.FSQA	MSC.FSQA	FOOD SCIENCE	Keith Warriner	Robert Gordon
	MSC.HHNS	MSC.HHNS	HUMAN HEALTH AND NUTRITIONAL SCI	Coral Murrant	Michael Emes
	MSC.MAST-MATH	MSC.MAST-MATH	MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS	David Kribs	Anthony Vannelli
	MSC.PHYS	MSC.PHYS	PHYSICS	Paul Garrett	Anthony Vannelli
	MSC.POPM	MSC.POPM	POPULATION MEDICINE	Cate Dewey	Elizabeth Stone
	MUSC-Ma	MUSC-Ma	SCHOOL OF FINE ART & MUSIC	John Kissick	Donald Bruce
	NANO-Ma	NANO-Ma	CHEMISTRY	John Dutcher	Anthony Vannelli
	Non Credit - ALFRED CONTINUING EDUCATION	0468XX130	ALFRED CONTINUING EDUCATION	Renee Bergeron	Robert Gordon
	Non Credit - KEMPTVILLE CONTINUING ED	0476XX130	KEMPTVILLE CONTINUING ED	Claude Naud	Robert Gordon
	PHD.+TOX	PHD.+TOX	CHEMISTRY	Richard Manderville	Anthony Vannelli
	PHD.BIOP	PHD.BIOP	MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS	Hermann Eberl	Anthony Vannelli
	PHD.CS	PHD.CS	SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE (SOCS)	Gary Grewal	Anthony Vannelli
	PHD.FOOD	PHD.FOOD	FOOD SCIENCE	Loong-Tak Lim	Robert Gordon
	PHD.FRAN-FRHD	PHD.FRAN-FRHD	FAMILY RELATIONS & APPLIED NUTRITION	Michael Nightingale	Kerry Daly
	PHD.IBIO	PHD.IBIO	INTEGRATIVE BIOLOGY	Teri Crease	Michael Emes
	PHD.MAST-MATH	PHD.MAST-MATH	MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS	David Kribs	Anthony Vannelli
	PHD.MAST-STAT	PHD.MAST-STAT	MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS	David Kribs	Anthony Vannelli
	PHD.PLNT	PHD.PLNT	PLANT AGRICULTURE	Barry Shelp	Robert Gordon
	PHD.POPM	PHD.POPM	POPULATION MEDICINE	Cate Dewey	Elizabeth Stone
	PHD.PSYC	PHD.PSYC	PSYCHOLOGY	Lana Trick	Kerry Daly
	PSYC-Mi	PSYC-Mi	PSYCHOLOGY	Mary Ann Evans	Kerry Daly
	Research - ALFRED ACADEMIC	0466XX150	ALFRED ACADEMIC	Simon Lachance	Robert Gordon
	Research - CHEMISTRY	0255XX150	CHEMISTRY	Dan Thomas	Anthony Vannelli
	Research - ECONOMICS & FINANCE	0295XX150	ECONOMICS & FINANCE	Stephen Kosempel	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	Research - FAMILY RELATIONS & APPLIED NUTRITION	0170XX150	FAMILY RELATIONS & APPLIED NUTRITION	Michael Nightingale	Kerry Daly
	Research - FOOD AGRICULTURAL AND RESOURCE ECON	0105XX150	FOOD AGRICULTURAL AND RESOURCE ECONOMICS	Alan Ker	Robert Gordon
	Research - PSYCHOLOGY	0294XX150	PSYCHOLOGY	Mary Ann Evans	Kerry Daly

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

Ranking	PIR Form Programs	Program Identifier	Department Name	Author	Submitter
Q3	Research - SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE (SOCS)	0289XX150	SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE (SOCS)	Stefan Kremer	Anthony Vannelli
	Research - SCHOOL OF ENV. DESIGN & RURAL DEV	0111XX150	SCHOOL OF ENV. DESIGN & RURAL DEV	Rob Corry	Robert Gordon
	Research - SCHOOL OF HOSPITALITY & TOURISM MGT.	0185XX150	SCHOOL OF HOSPITALITY & TOURISM MGT.	Kerry Godfrey	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	Research Communications	0545XX530	AVP RESEARCH	John Livernois	Kevin Hall
	Research Enterprise and Scholarly Communications	0400XX630	CHIEF LIBRARIAN'S OFFICE	Wayne Johnston	Rebecca Graham
	Research Financial Services	0010XX1460	ASST VP FINANCIAL SERVICES	Dave Reinhart	John Miles
	Research Planning and Strategic Initiatives	0088XX540	VP RESEARCH - OPERATIONS	Abeir Arqusosi	Kevin Hall
	Ridgetown BDC Non Instruction	0464XX2420	RIDGETOWN CONTINUING EDUCATION	Ken McEwan	Robert Gordon
	Senior Management and Planning	0062XX1490	CCS - OPERATING	Jim Lennie	Rebecca Graham
	Senior Management and Planning	0391XX1490	VP AA&D	Lyndon Stewart	Alastair Summerlee
	Service	0195XX160	CME DEAN'S OFFICE	Julia Christensen-Hughes	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	Service	0250XX160	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Katherine Ferus	Kerry Daly
	SOC-Ma	SOC-Ma	SOCIOLOGY & ANTHROPOLOGY	Patrick Parnaby	Kerry Daly
	Special Learning Environments	0013XX990	HOUSING SERVICES	Irene Thompson	Brenda Whiteside
	STAT-Mi	STAT-Mi	MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS	David Kribs	Anthony Vannelli
	THPY-Ma	THPY-Ma	PHYSICS	Eric Poisson	Anthony Vannelli
	THST-Ma	THST-Ma	SCHOOL OF ENGLISH AND THEATRE STUDIES	Alan Filewod	Donald Bruce
	TOX-Ma	TOX-Ma	CHEMISTRY	Richard Manderville	Anthony Vannelli
	Web Site Hosting and Development	0062XX1100	CCS - OPERATING	Kent Hoeg	Rebecca Graham
Q3 Total		99			

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

Ranking	PIR Form Programs	Program Identifier	Department Name	Author	Submitter
Q4	Academic Program Counselling	0250XX422	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Clare MacMartin	Kerry Daly
	Academic Program Counselling	0251XX422	DEAN - ARTS	Ann Wilson	Donald Bruce
	Alfred BDC Non Instruction	0468XX2420	ALFRED CONTINUING EDUCATION	Sonia Fournier	Robert Gordon
	ANTH-Ma	ANTH-Ma	SOCIOLOGY & ANTHROPOLOGY	Patrick Parnaby	Kerry Daly
	ANTH-Mi	ANTH-Mi	SOCIOLOGY & ANTHROPOLOGY	Patrick Parnaby	Kerry Daly
	ARTH-Ma	ARTH-Ma	SCHOOL OF FINE ART & MUSIC	John Kissick	Donald Bruce
	ARTH-Mi	ARTH-Mi	SCHOOL OF FINE ART & MUSIC	John Kissick	Donald Bruce
	BADM-Mi	BADM-Mi	ECONOMICS & FINANCE	Stephen Kosempel	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	BAG.HIST	BAG.HIST	HISTORY	Peter Goddard	Donald Bruce
	BAG.ID	BAG.ID	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Sally Humphries	Kerry Daly
	BAG.POLS	BAG.POLS	POLITICAL SCIENCE	Byron Sheldrick	Kerry Daly
	BAG.THST	BAG.THST	SCHOOL OF ENGLISH AND THEATRE STUDIES	Alan Filewod	Donald Bruce
	BAG.UND	BAG.UND	DEAN - ARTS	Ann Wilson	Donald Bruce
	BCG	BCG	SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE (SOCS)	Stefan Kremer	Anthony Vannelli
	BCOM.UND	BCOM.UND	CME DEAN'S OFFICE	Kerry Godfrey	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	CBaSE	0195XX590	CME DEAN'S OFFICE	Sylvain Charlebois	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	CHEM-Ma	CHEM-Ma	CHEMISTRY	Dan Thomas	Anthony Vannelli
	CHPY-Ma	CHPY-Ma	DEAN CPES	Eric Poisson	Anthony Vannelli
	CLAS-Ma	CLAS-Ma	SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES & LITERATURE	Clive Thomson	Donald Bruce
	College and Division Administrative Services	0251XX1500	DEAN - ARTS	Ann Wilson	Donald Bruce
	College and Division Administrative Services	0400XX1500	CHIEF LIBRARIAN'S OFFICE	Kelly Bertrand	Rebecca Graham
	College and Division Administrative Services - Alfred	0469XX1500	ALFRED ADMINISTRATION	Renee Bergeron	Robert Gordon
	College and Division Administrative Services - Kemptville	0480XX1500	KEMPTVILLE ADMINISTRATION	Claude Naud	Robert Gordon
	College and Division ITC Support	0201XX1200	DEAN - OVC	Paul McDonald	Elizabeth Stone
	Contracts and Grants (pre-award)	0545XX470	AVP RESEARCH	John Livernois	Kevin Hall
	DAGR - RIDGETOWN ACADEMIC	0462XXDAGR	RIDGETOWN ACADEMIC	Ken McEwan	Robert Gordon
	DFN - ALFRED ACADEMIC	0466XXDFN	ALFRED ACADEMIC	Gabriel Gauthier	Robert Gordon
	ECON-Ma	ECON-Ma	ECONOMICS & FINANCE	Stephen Kosempel	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	EM-Ma	EM-Ma	ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES	Jonathan Newman	Robert Gordon
	ENGL-Ma	ENGL-Ma	SCHOOL OF ENGLISH AND THEATRE STUDIES	Alan Filewod	Donald Bruce
	ERM-Ma	ERM-Ma	GEOGRAPHY	John Smithers	Kerry Daly
	Executive Management and Administration	0400XX1320	CHIEF LIBRARIAN'S OFFICE	Rebecca Graham	Rebecca Graham
	FAB-Ma	FAB-Ma	FOOD AGRICULTURAL AND RESOURCE ECONOMICS	Alan Ker	Robert Gordon
	Facility Renewal	0808XX1690	PROJECT MANAGEMENT	Dan MacLachlan	Bob Carter
	FREN-Ma	FREN-Ma	SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES & LITERATURE	Clive Thomson	Donald Bruce
	FREN-Mi	FREN-Mi	SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES & LITERATURE	Clive Thomson	Donald Bruce
	General Research Administration	0545XX510	AVP RESEARCH	John Livernois	Kevin Hall
	GEOG-Mi	GEOG-Mi	GEOGRAPHY	John Smithers	Kerry Daly
	GIS-Mi	GIS-Mi	GEOGRAPHY	John Smithers	Kerry Daly
	Guelph Humber Instruction	0251XX60	DEAN - ARTS	Ann Wilson	Donald Bruce

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

Ranking	PIR Form Programs	Program Identifier	Department Name	Author	Submitter
Q4	Guelph Humber Psychology	0539XX3025	GUELPH HUMBER PROGRAMS	George Bragues	George Bragues
	Guelph Humber Registrarial Services	0539XX3035	GUELPH HUMBER PROGRAMS	George Bragues	George Bragues
	Guelph Humber Student Support	0539XX3050	GUELPH HUMBER PROGRAMS	George Bragues	George Bragues
	HISP-Mi	HISP-Mi	SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES & LITERATURE	Clive Thomson	Donald Bruce
	HIST-Mi	HIST-Mi	HISTORY	Peter Goddard	Donald Bruce
	ID_EAD	ID_EAD	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Sally Humphries	Kerry Daly
	ID_EBD	ID_EBD	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Sally Humphries	Kerry Daly
	ID_GAD	ID_GAD	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Sally Humphries	Kerry Daly
	ID_HPD	ID_HPD	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Sally Humphries	Kerry Daly
	ID_RAD	ID_RAD	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Sally Humphries	Kerry Daly
	ID-Ma	ID-Ma	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Sally Humphries	Kerry Daly
	ID-Mi	ID-Mi	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Sally Humphries	Kerry Daly
	Judicial and Procedural Services	0331XX1360	ASSOCIATE VP ACADEMIC	Serge Desmarais	Serge Desmarais
	Kemptville BDC Non Instruction	0476XX2420	KEMPTVILLE CONTINUING ED	Claude Naud	Robert Gordon
	Legal Services	0002XX1350	EXECUTIVE OFFICES	Mary Childs	Alastair Summerlee
	MA.EURS	MA.EURS	SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES & LITERATURE	Clive Thomson	Donald Bruce
	MA.LACS	MA.LACS	SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES & LITERATURE	Clive Thomson	Donald Bruce
	MA.MASC.MSC.+IDEV	MA.MASC.MSC.+IDEV	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Sally Humphries	Kerry Daly
	MBNF.MSC.BINF	MBNF.MSC.BINF	DEAN - BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE	Paul McNicholas	Michael Emes
	MENG	MENG	SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING	Doug Joy	Anthony Vannelli
	MSC.BMED	MSC.BMED	BIOMEDICAL SCIENCE	Neil MacLusky	Elizabeth Stone
	MSC.FRAN-AHN	MSC.FRAN-AHN	FAMILY RELATIONS & APPLIED NUTRITION	Michael Nightingale	Kerry Daly
	MSC.FRAN-FRHD	MSC.FRAN-FRHD	FAMILY RELATIONS & APPLIED NUTRITION	Michael Nightingale	Kerry Daly
	MSC.GEOG	MSC.GEOG	GEOGRAPHY	John Smithers	Kerry Daly
	Multi Faith Programming	0533XX900	COUNSELLING	Bruno Mancini	Brenda Whiteside
	NANS-Mi	NANS-Mi	HUMAN HEALTH AND NUTRITIONAL SCI	Lawrence Spriet	Michael Emes
	PHD.+IDEV	PHD.+IDEV	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Sally Humphries	Kerry Daly
	PHD.+NEUR	PHD.+NEUR	DEAN - BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE	Neil MacLusky	Michael Emes
	PHD.APS	PHD.APS	ANIMAL & POULTRY SCIENCE	John Cant	Robert Gordon
	PHD.BMED	PHD.BMED	BIOMEDICAL SCIENCE	Neil MacLusky	Elizabeth Stone
	PHD.CHEM	PHD.CHEM	CHEMISTRY	Dan Thomas	Anthony Vannelli
	PHD.ENG	PHD.ENG	SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING	Doug Joy	Anthony Vannelli
	PHD.FARE	PHD.FARE	FOOD AGRICULTURAL AND RESOURCE ECONOMICS	John Cranfield	Robert Gordon
	PHD.GEOG	PHD.GEOG	GEOGRAPHY	John Smithers	Kerry Daly
	PHD.HIST+TUHP	PHD.HIST+TUHP	HISTORY	Peter Goddard	Donald Bruce
	PHD.PABI	PHD.PABI	PATHOBIOLOGY DEPT.	Robert Jacobs	Elizabeth Stone
	PHD.PHIL	PHD.PHIL	PHILOSOPHY	Mark McCullagh	Donald Bruce
	PHD.POLS	PHD.POLS	POLITICAL SCIENCE	Byron Sheldrick	Kerry Daly
	PHIL-Ma	PHIL-Ma	PHILOSOPHY	Mark McCullagh	Donald Bruce
	PMGT-Ma	PMGT-Ma	ECONOMICS & FINANCE	Stephen Kosempel	Julia Christensen-Hughes

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

Ranking	PIR Form Programs	Program Identifier	Department Name	Author	Submitter
Q4	POLS-Mi	POLS-Mi	POLITICAL SCIENCE	Byron Sheldrick	Kerry Daly
	REH-Ma	REH-Ma	MARKETING AND CONSUMER STUDIES	Vinay Kanetkar	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	Research - BUSINESS	0190XX150	BUSINESS	Davar Rezanian	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	Research - CLINICAL STUDIES	0220XX150	CLINICAL STUDIES	Carolyn Kerr	Elizabeth Stone
	Research - MARKETING AND CONSUMER STUDIES	0180XX150	MARKETING AND CONSUMER STUDIES	Vinay Kanethar	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	Research - SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES & LITERATURE	0275XX150	SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES & LITERATURE	Clive Thomson	Donald Bruce
	Research and Partnerships	0062XX1120	CCS - OPERATING	Gayleen Gray	Rebecca Graham
	SART-Ma	SART-Ma	SCHOOL OF FINE ART & MUSIC	John Kissick	Donald Bruce
	Senior Management and Planning	0250XX1490	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Kerry Daly	Kerry Daly
	Senior Management and Planning	0251XX1490	DEAN - ARTS	Ann Wilson	Donald Bruce
	Service	0253XX160	DEAN CPES	Joseph Cunsolo	Anthony Vannelli
	Space Management	0832XX1520	SPACE AND CAPITAL PLANNING	Dan MacLachlan	Bob Carter
	STAT-Ma	STAT-Ma	MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS	David Kribs	Anthony Vannelli
	Transfer Students	0442XX220	ADMISSIONS	Deanna Plexman	Brian Pettigrew
	University Fleet	0841XX1610	TRANSPORTATION SERVICE	Claudia Runciman	Bob Carter
	ZOO-Mi	ZOO-Mi	INTEGRATIVE BIOLOGY	Moir Ferguson	Michael Emes
Q4 Total		96			

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

Ranking	PIR Form Programs	Program Identifier	Department Name	Author	Submitter
Q5	Alfred Academic Support	0466XX2410	ALFRED ACADEMIC	Renee Bergeron	Robert Gordon
	Animal Facilities	0095XX550	CAMPUS ANIMAL FACILITIES	Ken Hough	Kevin Hall
	APMS-Ma	APMS-Ma	MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS	David Kribs	Anthony Vannelli
	BAG.ANTH	BAG.ANTH	SOCIOLOGY & ANTHROPOLOGY	Patrick Parnaby	Kerry Daly
	BAG.ENGL	BAG.ENGL	SCHOOL OF ENGLISH AND THEATRE STUDIES	Alan Filewod	Donald Bruce
	BAG.FREN	BAG.FREN	SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES & LITERATURE	Clive Thomson	Donald Bruce
	BAG.GEOG	BAG.GEOG	GEOGRAPHY	John Smithers	Kerry Daly
	BAG.HISP	BAG.HISP	SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES & LITERATURE	Clive Thomson	Donald Bruce
	BAG.MATH	BAG.MATH	MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS	David Kribs	Anthony Vannelli
	BAG.MUSC	BAG.MUSC	SCHOOL OF FINE ART & MUSIC	John Kissick	Donald Bruce
	BAG.PHIL	BAG.PHIL	PHILOSOPHY	Mark McCullagh	Donald Bruce
	BIOC-Mi	BIOC-Mi	MOLECULAR & CELLULAR BIOLOGY	Chris Whitfield	Michael Emes
	BIOT-Mi	BIOT-Mi	MOLECULAR & CELLULAR BIOLOGY	Chris Whitfield	Michael Emes
	Bookstore	0014XX1070	HOSPITALITY SERVICES	Ed Townsley	David Boeckner
	BSCG.PSCI	BSCG.PSCI	DEAN CPES	Joseph Cunsolo	Anthony Vannelli
	BSES.ECOL-Ma	BSES.ECOL-Ma	INTEGRATIVE BIOLOGY	Moiria Ferguson	Michael Emes
	CHEM-Mi	CHEM-Mi	CHEMISTRY	Dan Thomas	Anthony Vannelli
	CJPP-Mi	CJPP-Mi	SOCIOLOGY & ANTHROPOLOGY	Patrick Parnaby	Kerry Daly
	CLAS-Mi	CLAS-Mi	SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES & LITERATURE	Clive Thomson	Donald Bruce
	College and Division Administrative Services	0253XX1500	DEAN CPES	Anthony Vannelli	Anthony Vannelli
	College and Division ITC Support	0008XX1200	OPSRV	Sue Bennett	Alastair Summerlee
	DAGR - ALFRED ACADEMIC	0466XXDAGR	ALFRED ACADEMIC	Gabriel Gauthier	Robert Gordon
	DEQN	0475XXDEQN	KEMPTVILLE ACADEMIC	Claude Naud	Robert Gordon
	DFN - KEMPTVILLE ACADEMIC	0475XXDFN	KEMPTVILLE ACADEMIC	Claude Naud	Robert Gordon
	ECC-Mi	ECC-Mi	DEAN - ARTS	Clive Thomson	Donald Bruce
	ECON-Mi	ECON-Mi	ECONOMICS & FINANCE	Stephen Kosempel	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	EEP-Ma	EEP-Ma	FOOD AGRICULTURAL AND RESOURCE ECONOMICS	Alan Ker	Robert Gordon
	EGG-Ma	EGG-Ma	GEOGRAPHY	John Smithers	Kerry Daly
	ELS-Mi	ELS-Mi	PHILOSOPHY	Mark McCullagh	Donald Bruce
	ENGL-Mi	ENGL-Mi	SCHOOL OF ENGLISH AND THEATRE STUDIES	Alan Filewod	Donald Bruce
	External and Community Relations	0088XX541	VP RESEARCH - OPERATIONS	Abeir Arqusosi	Kevin Hall
	FARE-Ma	FARE-Ma	FOOD AGRICULTURAL AND RESOURCE ECONOMICS	Alan Ker	Robert Gordon
	FCS-Mi	FCS-Mi	FAMILY RELATIONS & APPLIED NUTRITION	Michael Nightingale	Kerry Daly
	FENG-Mi	FENG-Mi	SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING	Hussein Abdullah	Anthony Vannelli
	GDIP.CLST	GDIP.CLST	CLINICAL STUDIES	Carolyn Kerr	Elizabeth Stone
	GDIP.EDWR	GDIP.EDWR	SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING	Doug Joy	Anthony Vannelli
	GDIP.FSQA	GDIP.FSQA	FOOD SCIENCE	Keith Warriner	Robert Gordon
	General Enterprise Applications (Tier II)	0062XX1170	CCS - OPERATING	Jim Lennie	Rebecca Graham
	GEOG-Ma	GEOG-Ma	GEOGRAPHY	John Smithers	Kerry Daly
	GERM-Mi	GERM-Mi	SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES & LITERATURE	Clive Thomson	Donald Bruce

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

Ranking	PIR Form Programs	Program Identifier	Department Name	Author	Submitter
Q5	Graduate Recruitment and Admissions	0456XX171	GRADUATE STUDIES	Pauline Sinclair	Anthony Clarke
	Guelph Humber Instruction	0250XX60	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Clare MacMartin	Kerry Daly
	HISP-Ma	HISP-Ma	SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES & LITERATURE	Clive Thomson	Donald Bruce
	Houses	0013XX1010	HOUSING SERVICES	Irene Thompson	Brenda Whiteside
	ID_LAS	ID_LAS	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Sally Humphries	Kerry Daly
	ID_PEAC	ID_PEAC	CSAHS DEAN'S OFFICE	Sally Humphries	Kerry Daly
	ISHB-Ma	ISHB-Ma	SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE (SOCS)	Stefan Kremer	Anthony Vannelli
	IS-Ma	IS-Ma	DEAN - ARTS	Ann Wilson	Donald Bruce
	ITAL-Mi	ITAL-Mi	SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES & LITERATURE	Clive Thomson	Donald Bruce
	Kemptville Academic Support	0475XX2410	KEMPTVILLE ACADEMIC	Claude Naud	Robert Gordon
	MA.AVC	MA.AVC	SCHOOL OF FINE ART & MUSIC	John Kissick	Donald Bruce
	MA.FREN	MA.FREN	SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES & LITERATURE	Clive Thomson	Donald Bruce
	MA.PHIL	MA.PHIL	PHILOSOPHY	Mark McCullagh	Donald Bruce
	MA.POLS	MA.POLS	POLITICAL SCIENCE	Byron Sheldrick	Kerry Daly
	MA.SOC	MA.SOC	SOCIOLOGY & ANTHROPOLOGY	Patrick Parnaby	Kerry Daly
	MA.THST	MA.THST	SCHOOL OF ENGLISH AND THEATRE STUDIES	Alan Filewod	Donald Bruce
	MAEC-Ma	MAEC-Ma	ECONOMICS & FINANCE	Stephen Kosempel	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	MATH-Mi	MATH-Mi	MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS	David Kribs	Anthony Vannelli
	MBG-Mi	MBG-Mi	MOLECULAR & CELLULAR BIOLOGY	Chris Whitfield	Michael Emes
	MBS.BMED	MBS.BMED	BIOMEDICAL SCIENCE	Neil MacLusky	Elizabeth Stone
	MCS.CLST	MCS.CLST	CLINICAL STUDIES	Carolyn Kerr	Elizabeth Stone
	MKMN-Mi	MKMN-Mi	MARKETING AND CONSUMER STUDIES	Vinay Kanetkar	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	MSC.+NEUR	MSC.+NEUR	DEAN - BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE	Neil MacLusky	Michael Emes
	MSC.BIOP	MSC.BIOP	MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS	Hermann Eberl	Anthony Vannelli
	MSC.CHEM:C	MSC.CHEM:C	CHEMISTRY	Dan Thomas	Anthony Vannelli
	MSC.CLST	MSC.CLST	CLINICAL STUDIES	Carolyn Kerr	Elizabeth Stone
	MSC.CS	MSC.CS	SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE (SOCS)	Gary Grewal	Anthony Vannelli
	MSC.MAST-STAT	MSC.MAST-STAT	MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS	David Kribs	Anthony Vannelli
	MSC.PABI	MSC.PABI	PATHOBIOLOGY DEPT.	Robert Jacobs	Elizabeth Stone
	MSCI-Mi	MSCI-Mi	MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS	David Kribs	Anthony Vannelli
	MS-Mi	MS-Mi	SCHOOL OF FINE ART & MUSIC	John Kissick	Donald Bruce
	MUSC-Mi	MUSC-Mi	SCHOOL OF FINE ART & MUSIC	John Kissick	Donald Bruce
	Non Credit - HTM COURSES	0333XX130	HTM COURSES	Sylvain Charlebois	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	OAGR-Ma	OAGR-Ma	PLANT AGRICULTURE	Peter Pauls	Robert Gordon
	Office of Sustainability	0088XX543	VP RESEARCH - OPERATIONS	Abeir Arqusosi	Kevin Hall
	PBC-Ma	PBC-Ma	PSYCHOLOGY	Mary Ann Evans	Kerry Daly
	PBC-Mi	PBC-Mi	PSYCHOLOGY	Mary Ann Evans	Kerry Daly
	PHD.FRAN-AHN	PHD.FRAN-AHN	FAMILY RELATIONS & APPLIED NUTRITION	Michael Nightingale	Kerry Daly
	PHD.LSTS	PHD.LSTS	SCHOOL OF ENGLISH AND THEATRE STUDIES	Alan Filewod	Donald Bruce
	PHD.LTS	PHD.LTS	SCHOOL OF ENGLISH AND THEATRE STUDIES	Alan Filewod	Donald Bruce

Task Force Report on PPP | 2013

Ranking	PIR Form Programs	Program Identifier	Department Name	Author	Submitter
Q5	PHD.MGMT	PHD.MGMT	MARKETING AND CONSUMER STUDIES	Vinay Kanetkar	Julia Christensen-Hughes
	PHD.SOC	PHD.SOC	SOCIOLOGY & ANTHROPOLOGY	Patrick Parnaby	Kerry Daly
	PHIL-Mi	PHIL-Mi	PHILOSOPHY	Mark McCullagh	Donald Bruce
	PHYS-Ma	PHYS-Ma	PHYSICS	Eric Poisson	Anthony Vannelli
	PHYS-Mi	PHYS-Mi	PHYSICS	Eric Poisson	Anthony Vannelli
	PLSC-Mi	PLSC-Mi	PLANT AGRICULTURE	Peter Pauls	Robert Gordon
	Postage and Mail Services	0014XX1770	MAIL SERVICES	Wayne Brittenden	David Boeckner
	PSCI-Ma	PSCI-Ma	DEAN CPES	Joseph Cunsolo	Anthony Vannelli
	Research - KEMPTVILLE ACADEMIC	0475XX150	KEMPTVILLE ACADEMIC	Claude Naud	Robert Gordon
	Research - PATHOBIOLOGY DEPT.	0210XX150	PATHOBIOLOGY DEPT.	Robert Jacobs	Elizabeth Stone
	Research - PHILOSOPHY	0280XX150	PHILOSOPHY	Mark McCullagh	Donald Bruce
	Research - POLITICAL SCIENCE	0293XX150	POLITICAL SCIENCE	Byron Sheldrick	Kerry Daly
	Research - SOCIOLOGY & ANTHROPOLOGY	0292XX150	SOCIOLOGY & ANTHROPOLOGY	Patrick Parnaby	Kerry Daly
	Service	0201XX160	DEAN - OVC	Carol Ann Higgins	Elizabeth Stone
	Service	0251XX160	DEAN - ARTS	Ann Wilson	Donald Bruce
	SOC-Mi	SOC-Mi	SOCIOLOGY & ANTHROPOLOGY	Patrick Parnaby	Kerry Daly
	THST-Mi	THST-Mi	SCHOOL OF ENGLISH AND THEATRE STUDIES	Alan Filewod	Donald Bruce
	University Centre Administration	0034XX1800	DIRECTOR UNIVERSITY CENTRE	William McNaughton	William McNaughton
Q5 Total		98			
Total Programs		492			