

Questions Submitted in Advance of April 27 Program Prioritization Forum

Why would certificate programs be allowed that only average 1 (or 2) completions per year? 1 or 2 is not much different than zero. This would not be worth the costs or labor hours to maintain.

It is recognized that the bar is not high. For some certificate programs, the argument was made that few resources are actually needed to administer the program. To give those programs the opportunity to continue, the recommendation was set at this level. Others may decide to set a higher bar as this discussion unfolds.

What is the University position towards introducing new programs (either graduate or undergraduate) and/or certifications at this time?

Discussions are underway about whether new programs should be subjected to discussions such as those applied to all programs in this initiative. A “New Program” rubric is being recommended to assist in the development of new programs and the assignment of time commitments to developing new programs.

Given that the prospective student pool is expected to decrease in near future, how will enrollment in a specific program be regarded if not showing increase?

It would depend on the level of decrease. Programs that struggle to maintain enrollment may not be resourced at the same level in the future.

Are you crunching the enrollment numbers in an objective way to determine which programs are carrying their own weight? In the past, extremely small programs have been protected. Are programs given a timeline to bring up their enrollments to protect high staffing levels or will they be allowed to let other program carry them? And, will faculty in programs that are high enrolled be given merit pay or incentives for attracting large numbers of students?

Yes, the task force objectively reviewed enrollment data and information provided by different stakeholders. The task force will be recommending timelines for increasing enrollment. The merit pay discussion is beyond the scope of the task force.

What are some overarching themes or topic areas that are of local/regional/national importance that numerous programs may contribute toward? How can these programs make contributions to these overarching themes and subject areas?

These discussions are ongoing. Broadly speaking, the task force has discussed the importance of community impact and considered how certain university initiatives (like resilience, maritime, cybersecurity, STEM-H, public health, and so on) align with regional needs. The report will address specific themes that have guided our discussions and precipitated the need for the initiative. The

strategic planning process to be implemented under incoming president Brian Hemphill will provide direction for merging together these themes and subject areas.

How soon will any recommended changes, assuming they are accepted by academic affairs, be implemented?

It is our hope that the changes would begin to be made in the upcoming year. The timing of them would be determined by those making the final decisions.

Will resources outside of Academic Affairs (i.e. SEES) that relate to academic advising/student success be reviewed to determine how resources can best be allocated to support student success and retention?

Our task was to focus on Academic Affairs units. Given that many student support services extend across all parts of the university, where appropriate the task force will recommend that broader reviews be undertaken.

Are any interdisciplinary majors being considered (i.e. majors that would be a collaboration between different colleges, such as health sciences and sciences, or education and health sciences) moving forward?

We focused solely on current programming, so any interdisciplinary efforts that currently exist were reviewed.

If an academic program will be eliminated, when will faculty be notified?

As soon as the decision is made and in accordance with the faculty handbook.

What are the primary goals of this initiative? When are you going to invite faculty members to have input? Or is there such an opportunity at all?

Faculty can submit input at any time on the initiative website. After the report is made public, we will continue to solicit feedback. The goals are to prioritize investments, identify opportunities for efficiency, and prepare academic affairs for future enrollment, policy, and technological changes.

What will the final product be from the effort? Actionable recommendations? What are the measures of success for the effort?

Specific recommendations will be made to the provost, deans, and faculty senate. Measures of success will be based on the criteria reviewed in the initiative, to include enrollment growth, cost per credit hour, job placement for graduates, program rankings, number of degrees awarded, and so on.

Do you foresee suggesting some restructuring to reduce numbers of departments?

Where appropriate, some restructuring may be recommended.

What is the strategy for faculty hiring? Is it a conscious effort to marginalize the tenure-line faculty by overwhelming their numbers with FT Lecturers, PT Adjuncts, Research Faculty, and Administrative Faculty? According to the September 2019 BoV Minutes, e.g., that year 91 hires were made under the heading of "Faculty," of whom 8 were tenure track. It cannot be denied that there is a pattern here. We would like to know the strategy behind it.

This is beyond the scope of our discussion, but this is an important question. You are encouraged to discuss this with your chair, dean, and provost.