

University of Western Ontario Project/Work Prioritization Score Sheet

Section 1: General Infor	mation								
Project/Work Name:	Graduate Student Progressio	on							
Project/Work Description	Graduate students at Western must milestones set by the program. Regu Currently these progress reports are at Western.	ular reports are required to h	elp monitor students' progress.						
(provide a high level description of this request – what, when, why)	This project aims to improve the way the effect it has over timely graduate critical outcomes and Western must milestones throughout their careers	degree progression. Progre be aware of our graduate sto	ession and graduating rates are udents' progress through various						
	In May 2013, the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, Office of the Registrar, and We Information Systems Group completed work on a project releasing the vanilla Campus Solution component Advisor Center to faculty members holding SGPS membership, for the purposes of monitoring graduate student progress for those students recorded under their supervision. Whi out-of-the-box Advisor Center has provided our supervisors with considerable detail on course registration and grading it ignores the work graduate students complete outside of the traditional classroom (i.e. thesis progression, comprehensive exams, publications) and fails to provide det on other influences on student success (i.e. financial aid, professional development). Furtherm the potential for sharing this information with other key stakeholders (graduate assistants, gradu chairs, and associate deans) has been ignored to date.								
	SGPS currently requires the Graduate Chair to approve each student's plan of study and ensure preparation and filing of an annual progress report between student and supervisor. These report are designed to gauge the progress a student has made towards their degree and plan the next phase of their studies. To date, the methods by which these tasks are completed have been left programs to determine. As such the 87 distinct programs that offer graduate degrees to Westerr students have each crafted unique and varying methods to record and maintain this information. Time and effort is being spent across the community maintaining unique processes that all have common objective. In addition, with the lack of consistency and consolidation of these reports th is no method to gauge the overall progress of the graduate student body across the various disciplines and faculties on campus. SGPS is requesting an extension of the vanilla Advisor Center component and the creation of a batch reporting process which will manage the required collection and oversight that both measu and communicates the progress of all graduate students including existing Student Center information (i.e. courses, milestones) alongside the following new areas of information to Student Center:								
	Publications								
	Co-curricular Activities/Section	ervice							
	Conferences								
	Memberships Professional Development	ot							
	Travel	in and the second se							
	Thesis Progress								
	This will ensure that our students are given a consistent and reliable method to communicate their progress to their academic stakeholders and feedback can be collected in a standardized, accessible, and quantifiable manner across the community. SGPS will ensure that the community has the necessary resources to keep ahead of student needs and Western will be able to collectively review how our students achieve success throughout each of our graduate programs.								
Submitted By:	Linda Miller	Department/Unit:	School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies						
Functional Contact:	Matt Dumouchel	Requested Completion Date:	March 1, 2015						



University of Western Ontario Project/Work Prioritization Score Sheet

Section 2: Project/Work Classification and Total Score									
Project/Work Category (<i>select one</i>)	Regulatory/Mandated ¹	Total Prioritization Score:	Total Score = 62						
	Y Improvement/Efficiency	(tally from score sheet –highest possible score = 75)	Priority: Y High (>51)						
	Operational- Admin System Maintenance ²		☐ Medium (26-50) ☐ Low (0-25)						

¹ May be internally or externally mandated ² May be a problem resolution or an upgrade

Section 3: Prioritization Scoring											
Strategic Impact Criteria (revised 20140501)											
Score		□ 0 Y 25									
Alignment with Key University Strategies		World Class Research and Scholarship Culture (e.g. In support of recruiting and retaining Faculty, collaboration with other universities, inputs & outputs of Research)									
(Select one or more)	 Y Best Education for Global Leaders (e.g. Promotion of internationalization, community experience, international learning, research learning, teaching & learning, program expansion, student success) Engaging Alumni, Community, Institutional and International Partners (e.g. In support of internationalization, recruitment) Y Generating and Investing in New Resources in Support of Excellence (e.g. Campaigns, managing current resources, promoting efficiency) 										
Score				1				3			5
Client Strategic Priority (Within own unit)		(Low) (Medium) (High)									
Client Impact Criteria											
Score		0	0 1 2		2		3	4		5	
Client Satisfaction, Improvement Addressed		(None	e)	(Minima	al)			(Moderate) Y			(Major)



University of Western Ontario Project/Work Prioritization Score Sheet

Overall Client Scope Impact	(<5%)	(5-10%)	(11-20%)	(21-40%)	(41-75%)	(>75%)
(addresses what % of the client base – i.e. students, staff, faculty)						Y

Operational Impact Criteria									
Score	0	2	3	4	5				
Degree of Process & Quality Improvement	(None)	(Small)	(Moderate)	(Major) Y	(Transformation)				
Sustainability of changes in evolving environment (foundational to future process or technical improvement and/or risk of not doing it)	(No impact)	(Little impact)	(Some impact) Y	(Moderate impact)	(Major impact)				

Risk Factor Criteria									
Score	5	3	1	0					
Business Result Risk (probability of benefits being realized)	(guaranteed)	(High) Y	(Average)	(Low)					
Complexity of Initiative	(None)	(Low) Y	(Medium)	(High)					
Skill set. Hardware or Software Uncertainty	(None) Y	(One type)	(Two types)	(All three types)					

Financial Impact Criteria										
Score	0	1	2	3	4	5				
1 st year cost savings	< \$1K	<u>></u> \$1K & < \$25K Y	<u>></u> \$25K & < \$50K	<u>></u> \$50K & < \$75K	<u>></u> \$75K & < \$100K	<u>></u> \$100K				
Project Expense ³	<u>></u> \$100K	≥ \$75K & < \$100K	<u>></u> \$50K & < \$75K	<u>></u> \$25K & < \$50K	<u>></u> \$1K & < \$25K	< \$1K Y				

³ Additional resources (backfill positions), hardware/software costs