New Programs Task Force Final Report

Enclosed is the New Programs Task Force Final Report and two appendices:

Appendix A: Marketing Research New Program/Certificate Proposal Process

Appendix B: CCHE New Program Proposals 2011-2018.

Cover Page
Task Force: New Programs Task Force
Committee Chair(s): Leo Welch, Dean, College of Performing and Visual Arts
Committee Members and Titles:
Paul Bobrowski, Dean, Monfort College of Business;
Sean Broghammer, Director of Admissions;
Shannon Courtney, Senior Lecturer, Sport and Exercise Science;
Jason Hughes, Assistant Vice President for Marketing;
Jennifer Leffler, Technical Services Manager, Library Operations;
Alan Morse, Professor, Sports and Exercise Science

Date: 12.3.2018

Report Format
Summary of Recommendations – Provide your committee's recommendations in a numbered list in the space below.

1) Set broad, clear strategic institutional goals for creating new programs. i.e. interdisciplinary studies, enlarging or building on programs that already have a strong reputation on campus (brand identity), programs that are aligned with regional needs.
2) Use a grassroots process (faculty driven, guided by the administration) for generating new ideas while welcoming ideas from across campus.
3) The institution should choose programs using internal or external proposals that are likely to succeed based on, for example: brand synergies, excess capacity, incremental additions, student need data, and market trend data.
4) Further resource existing strong programs based upon retention rates, graduation rates, what the market determines for desirable degrees; consider the expense of programs.
5) Continue to develop an informal and formal review process that involves accurate enrollment predictors, market scans, and return on investment, among other criteria, to set goals and evaluate success of new programs launched. See appendix A.
6) The importance of diversity in delivery--specifically hybrid, or an online option--is critical.

7) Programs should be able to demonstrate how they prepare students for professional lives after graduation and meet the objectives of UNC's Institutional Learning Outcomes, which are tailored to meeting workforce needs, expectations.
8) When possible, each new program should have a set of co-curricular learning experiences relevant to the student's field of study.
9) Final decisions should be made based upon the needs of the institution.
10) New programs should include a first year experience with the major; creating community should be a strong consideration.
11) Three-year programs with summer included should be considered and evaluated regarding their potential.

Detailed Discussion of Recommendations – Type your responses to the questions below in the space provided. You may add space as needed.
1. In what ways do these recommendations align with the guiding principles for all task force committees?

Through the eleven summarized recommendations, the New Programs Task Force prioritized student learning and outcomes by developing a plan to support new and emerging programs that will meet the needs of changing student demographics and support campus efforts for financial sustainability at UNC. Each of the recommendations are tied to a clear outcome with actionable steps and accountability measures. Specific recommendations were developed in the areas of career-readiness and co-curricular learning experiences. All recommendations provide a strong framework for program development, delivery, and swiftness to market. These will provide UNC with greater flexibility and the ability to adapt new offerings to meet the needs of prospective students.

2. What resources would be saved or required to implement and sustain these recommendations? Remember that resources include human, financial, technology, and facilities.

For these recommendations to be implemented and sustained, committees/teams will be required to set up structures, author policies and procedures and otherwise support the work required to advance the goals listed. Resources could be considerable in the near term, but much less as UNC moves forward.

More important is the manner in which UNC must proceed to accomplish these tasks. For UNC to be more competitive relative to the larger state institutions, UNC must be become much more agile. The design of structures, policies, procedures, etc. must be streamlined to efficiently and effectively move programs from concept to implementation faster than in our prior experience of creating new programs.

The subgroup also recommends that the university set up and fund marketing efforts in support of new programs in a way that ensures each new program launch has the resources required to reach potential students. Additionally, human and financial resources in the recruitment divisions (and University Relations) that help support its use of a market

research tool (current, Emsi) will also have to be sustained in order to appropriately scan and evaluate markets, opportunities, and program competitiveness.

3. How would implementation of these recommendations improve existing programs and services?

New programs, minors, certificates, or improving existing curriculum decisions need to be based on the data and criterion markers provided in this report. Doing so would better serve the needs of the students in their respective programs. Implementation of these strategies will better prepare students for their career paths by providing them up-to-date curriculum with a foundation in technology, experiential learning, internship/capstone opportunities, etc.

4. What services or programs could be phased out because they would no longer be needed or because implementation of the recommendations would represent a more effective and efficient use of university resources?

n/a

5. Who would be primarily responsible for implementing these recommendations and have those individuals/units been consulted?

President's Office, Provost (Academic Affairs), Deans, Integrated Recruitment and Marketing Team, University Relations. They have been consulted.

6. Action Plan – complete the table on the following page outlining the concrete actions required for implementing your committee's recommendations, performance metrics (how we would know UNC is making progress and/or achieving success), who would be responsible for implementation, and whether implementation would begin in the short or long term.

Action Plan (add lines as needed)

Recommendation 1: Develop a clear set of strategic institutional priorities as a university and enact them; periodically encourage new program submissions with an active call to campus.		
Performance Metric(s): Announcement of priorities to campus		
Action	Responsibility	Short or Long Term
President and Provost convene a working ad hoc committee for recommendations	President-Provost in conjunction with the faculty, deans and campus	Short term
Recommendation 2: Develop a weighted checklist of needed items for new programs. This list might include: resources available (grants, private funding), market demand, especially in "soft" areas where the competition is less; innovative or market appropriate; competitive edge due to the excellence of existing programs; excess program capacity; first year major experience;		
Performance Metric(s): Successful development of a weighted checklist		
Action	Responsibility	Short or Long Term
President and Provost convene a working ad hoc committee for recommendations	President-Provost	Short term
Recommendation 3: Recommend pragmatic "small steps" to enhance strong existing programs; identify what options may be possible such as data analytics within degree programs that already exist; focus on effective recruitment of specific targeted cohorts.		
Performance Metric(s): enrollment growth of new students to UNC (to be defined by program as a target)		
Action	Responsibility	Short or Long Term
Develop performance metrics that measure strong programs: graduation rate, retention rate, student capacity, trends, cost of program, student interest	Deans with the approval of the provost	Immediate

Recommendation 4: Eliminate barriers that may obstruct access to existing programs. These barriers include: program titling, website navigation, etc.		
Performance Metric(s): Elimination of identified barriers		
Action	Responsibility	Short or Long Term
Deans and affected faculty (if applicable) work with conjunction with IRMT.	Deans and affected faculty with University Relations	Immediate

Recommendation 5: Set up agreed-upon marketing support plan and expand promotion marketing budget to begin to match competitors.		
Performance Metric(s): Embedded in new program metrics (concrete action step 2)		
Action	Responsibility	Short or Long Term
Develop marketing budget with specific expectations, key performance indicators (KPIs) and parameters	Academic Affairs; University Relations/IRMT	Short term

Recommendation 6: Develop a process for long-term incentives/ budget support regarding new programs.		
Performance Metric(s): new budget structure in place for new programs		
Action	Responsibility	Short or Long Term
Recommendations from the working ad hoc committee.	President-Provost	Long term

Recommendation 7: Three-year programs with summer included should be considered and evaluated regarding their potential.		
Performance Metric(s): Successful implementation of three year programs		
Action	Responsibility	Short or Long Term
1) Convene deans and IRMT to develop a feasibility study. 2) Build upon previous research conducted by PLT.	Deans-IRMT	Long term

Recommendation 8: New (all) programs should include a first year tie with the major; building a sense of community should be a consideration.		
Performance Metric(s): development of new programs with a first year major experience.		
Action	Responsibility	Short or Long Term
1) Weighted checklist (action plan, item 2) with this item as one of the criterion.	Deans/Provost	
Recommendation 9: Further resource existing strong programs based upon retention rates, graduation rates, what the market determines for desirable degrees; consider the expense of programs		
Performance Metric(s): numbers of students new to UNC		
Action	Responsibility	Short or Long Term
1) Charge to the ad hoc committee to develop criterion related to action plan item 3.	President-Provost	
Recommendation 10: Continue to develop an informal and formal review process that involves accurate enrollment predictors, market scans, and return on investment in the beginning of the process.		
Performance Metric(s):		
Action	Responsibility	Short or Long Term
We recommend evaluating existing programs, including newly launched programs, based on the following criteria: Marketability • New majors per year (% total of class) • Market share growth year-to-year (UNC vs. competitors) • Projected sector/industry growth for graduates	Provost—Deans—IRMT and its market research team (MRT)	
Cost • Cost to deliver per student (faculty, equipment, advising, etc). • Cost to recruit ($) compared to UNC average, college average		
Performance Indicators • Graduation rate compared to UNC average (if applicable) • Retention rate (average and by cohort) • Contribution margin (including unit and UNC overhead costs) – thresholds for measuring success should be different based		

where the program is in the life cycle, i.e. introduction, rapid growth, etc. • Total students served by program/faculty • Continuing headcount and/or credit hours per year (yield of majors year-to-year) • Growth rate per year in declared majors • Time to degree rate • Program growth as compared to aggregate market growth of similar programs (choose market – state, region, national)		
Recommendation 11: Use a grassroots process (faculty driven, guided by the administration) for generating new ideas. Model discussed with Deans in Spring 2018 offers framework for this process that begins with setting up forms and promotional schedule to invite and encourage submissions that are resourced and rewarded for successful approval.		
Performance Metric(s): increase in numbers of new program proposal and approvals.		
Action	Responsibility	Short or Long Term
Implementation of the above action steps.	All parties	
Recommendation 12: Develop an annual new program evaluation process with a decision to continue the new program in the third year review.		
Performance Metric(s): an evaluation process for new programs in place		
Action	Responsibility	Short or Long Term
See evaluation criteria in Recommendation 10, for example.	Ad Hoc Committee/AA/ Deans	