Academic Portfolio Task Force Interim Report 1
October 22, 2018

Contents

Undergraduate Program Discontinuance or Restructuring Interim Task Force Report

Task Force:	Academic Portfolio
Committee:	Undergraduate Program Discontinuance or Restructuring
Committee Chair(s):	Nancy Sileo and Burkhard Englert
Date:	October 22, 2018

Please provide a brief update on your committee's progress by responding to the four questions below.

1. What are the issues/questions your committee worked on during the reporting period?

In three sub-committees, we began to discuss the following questions:
  I. How do we create a UNC-wide approach to decide which programs belong in our academic portfolio?
  II. What data is needed to evaluate true costs of programs?
  III. What external universities/ models can we examine to consider what it would mean to change/revolutionize the Under Graduate (UG) program at UNC?
  IV. What resources would we need for programs that need to restructure, e.g. faculty development, circular design, converting to or adding an online option?
  V. How can we explore standard policies and practices for use of TAs, contingent faculty etc.?
  VI. Do we have and/or need 5-year schedules? A five-year schedule of course offerings would aid in graduation rates/plans/options for students in UG programs? How could we leverage long-range schedules to help units become more responsible to their students and for their programs?

2. What data or other information have you used (numbered or bulleted list is fine)?

We requested data needed to calculate the student credit hour production divided by the personnel costs in the unit (salaries for all faculty, including adjuncts) to determine cost per unit. In addition, we analyzed other universities (e.g. University of Akron, Humboldt State University etc. to discuss the approach for budget cuts.

3. What action steps are planned for the next reporting period?

We propose to investigate the following data sets:
  I. How much money does each unit bring in via student tuition and fees? What is the gross tuition and fee revenue generated by each unit?
  II. How much money does each unit cost? What are the expenses generated by each unit?
  III. What is the net revenue/cost for each unit?
  IV. Can a break-even analysis and a threshold analysis using the model which associated narrative be provided for FY18 (17-18)?
  V. What does it cost per unit to break even; how much does it costs to hire/pay faculty in different units?

VI.   Is it possible to conduct an enrollment analysis of courses? How often are courses offered? What is the enrollment in each course? What is the course capacity for each course as identified in the schedule?

VII.   Analyze the SAMPLE 2014-15 Break-even analysis.

VIII.   How would a discontinued program affect our degrees/students/other universities?

We are also request the following metrics:

- SCH per unit and SCH per faculty per unit
- Official enrollment by program/major within unit
- Number of majors/minors per unit and trends and growth/decline over time (3-year average) per unit.
- Number of faculty – fulltime tenure and tenure track and contract renewable per unit
- Number of adjuncts – used in FY 18 (broken down by term) per unit
- Number of staff – in each unit
- SCH produced by programs/units in each college
- Degrees conferred – actual number conferred per major per unit; also completion percentage per major per unit for a 3-5 year period

Our goals for the next months plus are:

I.   What does "unproductive" mean in order to identify programs to be discontinued or restructured?

II.   We will analyze a list of data/metrics to consider/use to determine programs that might be discontinued or restructured.

III.   We expect to determine how we will weigh the data and different metrics to make informed decisions about discontinuance or restructuring.

IV.   If a program meets the criteria for discontinuance or restructuring, we expect to recommend those units be contacted immediately so that there is contextual discussion about the program before final decisions are made.

V.   We will consider how a programs discontinuance or restructuring will impact student and provide suggestions for teach out plans.

4. What recommendations, if any, have been determined to date?

We will discuss this in our next meetings.

5. Please provide any additional information or comments.

Return to Contents

New or Expanded Academic Programs Report

Task Force:	Academic Portfolio
Committee:	New or Expanded Academic Programs
Committee Chair(s):	Leo Welch
Date:	October 22, 2018

Please provide a brief update on your committee's progress by responding to the four questions below.

1. What are the issues/questions your committee worked on during the reporting period?

> 1) We developed a sense of broad "best practices" for new degree models using summarized EAB data.
> 2) We used the committee charge, and guiding principles document as the primary guide to our work regarding the primary issues.
> 3) We developed a committee consensus on responses to a number of the issues addressed.

2. What data or other information have you used (numbered or bulleted list is fine)?

> 1) EAB best practices data from several articles on the EAB website regarding the launching of new programs.
> 2) Market Scan Key Findings data from University Relations (occupational data, competitors offering the degree, overall enrollment trends and predictions).
> 3) Article from the Chronicle reflecting the changing landscape of new program development (University of Akron article) August 16, 2018.
> 4) Marketing Research New Program/Certificate Proposal or how to get to "Go"process.
> 5) Review of Step One and Step Two new degree process at UNC.

3. What action steps are planned for the next reporting period?

> 1) Additional discussion is needed on specific markers (enrollment goals, net, return on investment) that predicate a new program's continuance.
> 2) Regional data is needed on proper program size.
> 3) We will continue to develop clear parameters on new program evaluation.
> 4) We will further refine our responses to specific committee charge questions including the need for specific institutional data.
> 5) We will discuss how UNC's Institutional Learning Outcomes are aligned with new program development.
> 6) We will investigate further if our present new program system aligns directly with the state process.
> 7) Continue to have discussions with Academic Task Force A Chair (program closure) as there are intersections between the two sub-groups.
> 8) We need to develop a hierarchy of concrete action steps that the university can incorporate both now and later.

4. What recommendations, if any, have been determined to date?

1) Set broad, clear institutional goals for new programs: i.e. interdisciplinary studies, programs that already have a strong reputation on campus (brand identity).
2) Use a grassroots process (faculty driven, guided by the administration) for generating new ideas.
3) 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.
4) Programs should be able to demonstrate how they prepare students for professional lives after graduation.
5) When possible each new program should have a set of co-curricular learning experiences relevant to the student's field of study
6) Final decisions should be made based upon the needs of the institution
7) The institution should choose programs using internal or external ideas to create ideas that include: brand synergies, excess capacity, incremental additions, student need data, and market trend data
8) Further resource existing strong programs based upon retention rates, graduation rates, what the market determines for desirable degrees; consider the expense of programs.
9) New programs should include a first year experience with the major; creating community should be a consideration.
10) Three-year programs with summer included should be considered and evaluated regarding their potential.

5. Please provide any additional information or comments.

Return to Contents

Liberal Arts Core Interim Task Force Report

Task Force:	Academic Portfolio
Committee:	LAC: Brook Blair, Diane Schott, Lyda McCartin, Tara Wood, Stacy Sharp, Jim Reardon, Jason Byrnes, Laura Connolly
Committee Chair(s):	Jason Byrnes, Laura Connolly
Date:	Oct 22, 2018

Please provide a brief update on your committee's progress by responding to the four questions below.

1. What are the issues/questions your committee worked on during the reporting period?

How to cut back on credits without losing international and multicultural content

How to provide more guidance for students through the LAC (pathways)
*by major?
*by cohort?

How ILOs match LAC SLOs and mission

How to provide a way to integrate the courses either across the LAC or, more importantly, within the major
  *   Portfolio approach? (probably not for now: expensive, labor intensive)
  *   Ensure this is an aspect embedded in LAC courses

How state requirements impact the organization of the LAC

Organize by competencies? (too confusing for students)

Use a minimalist approach? (just use gtP requirements, nothing more)

Could study abroad be used to satisfy Area 8 (international studies) SLOs?

2. What data or other information have you used (numbered or bulleted list is fine)?

UNC Institutional Learning Outcomes
gtP Competency Criteria Matrix
LAC Checklist
LAC Catalog Description
Data on frequency of offerings of LAC courses
EAB Report on General Education Curriculum Structure (2014)
EAB Report on Outcomes-Based General Education Programs (2012)

3. What action steps are planned for the next reporting period?

Data Analysis (matched subgroup members with relevant data sets with charge to bring insights gleaned to next meeting)

Feedback from LAC (Byrnes & Connolly met with LAC ad-hoc Curriculum Subcommittee, who have independently arrived at some of the same conclusions as this TF subgroup)

---

4. What recommendations, if any, have been determined to date?

Eliminate all LAC courses that haven't been taught in the past 5 years (however data shows that almost all LAC courses are taught regularly).

Several others are under consideration but haven't yet been decided.

---

5. Please provide any additional information or comments.

Return to Contents

Active Learning Interim Task Force Report

Education is not preparation for life; education is life itself. John Dewey

Task Force:	Academic Portfolio
Committee:	Active Learning Subcommittee
Committee Chair(s):	Deborah Romero, Mike Kimball
Date:	22nd October 2018

Please provide a brief update on your committee's progress by responding to the four questions below.

1. What are the issues/questions your committee worked on during the reporting period?

1) Recruited participants from key areas across campus, including engaged faculty from all colleges, leaders or those with expertise in the areas, and directors from CHE, Honors, Leadership, McNair, OUR, and representatives from cultural centers and graduate school. We also have six undergraduate students and one graduate student collaborating.

2) Reviewed and shared common language, definitions and terminology, especially Active Learning & HIPS

3) Identified the sub groups and participants that constitute the Active Learning Subcommittee as follows:
   - Community Engaged Learning
   - Internships (for credit and not for credit)
   - Study Abroad (including National Student Exchange and Faculty Led)
   - Undergraduate Research
   - On Campus Employment (refocused from work study to include all on-campus student
   - employment)

4) Launched a Team 365 workspace for document sharing and communications.

5) Identified exemplar practices for each of the above, and correlated these to HIPS, through a campus scan, and loaded these on a spreadsheet. Reviewed campus data and senior survey. Highlights include:
   - 70% took a course that included Community-based teaching/learning opportunities (outside of
   - internship or practicum courses)
   - 49% took a course that included Community-based research/scholarship opportunities (outside of
   - internship or practicum courses)
   - 12% participated in study abroad
   - 40% spent at least 1 month working on a professor's research project while at UNC
   - 17% participated in an undergraduate research program
   - 56% participated in an internship
   - 67% completed a culminating experience for their degree (e.g., capstone, thesis, comp exam)

6) Begun work to frame a proposal by considering:
   a) the impact of an active learning requirement for students in relation to our ILOs
   b) how many active learning "experiences" are sufficient for every undergraduate student;
   c) creation of active learning approval criteria for these experiences;
   d) design (or adoption of existing) approval process and infrastructure;
   e) identification of easy-to-implement tools for assessing.

7) Other observations:
   • Currently there is no centralized process to create language for syllabi for credit internships that address liabilities and legal issues related to internships
   • Career services is not always utilized as a central resource on campus and can serve as an expert in areas of internships and employment (all forms)
   • Currently, no process to advise students taking not-for-credit internships on liability
   • There are opportunities to make on-campus employment a High Impact Practice
   • Recognition that not all students can participate in all types of active learning, therefore acknowledge need to provide a menu of options and degrees of participation.
   • Personal experience within departments, classrooms, etc.
   • What does your program do v. what do you do in your own classes?

2. What data or other information have you used (numbered or bulleted list is fine)?

External research sources, national benchmarks and criteria include, but not limited to:

   • Active Learning Definitions and Resources (Bonwell and Eison, 1991)
   • High Impact Practices (Kuh, 2008)
   • Liberal Education & America's Promise (LEAP) Value Rubrics, especially for integrative learning (AAC&U)
   • Carnegie Classification Framework for Engaged Campuses
   • National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), including the modules for Civic Engagement, First Year Experiences & Senior Transitions, Global Learning, Inclusiveness and Cultural Diversity.
   •

UNC Internal resources:

   • Senior survey and CSS data
   • Definitions of various areas
   • Community & Civic Engagement 2020 plan
   • Institutional Learning Outcomes
   • UNC Engaged Learning SLO Guidelines

3. What action steps are planned for the next reporting period?

Complete all the steps outlined above for the proposal by:
   • Mapping active learning expectations to our ILOs, solidifying benchmark criteria for these experiences, and implementation process.

- • Develop an Active Learning Matrix that illustrates the levels and expectations for students in and across these activities informed by our experience and national standards.

Additional areas for exploration:
- • Gather criteria/expectations of Capstone/Internship requirements from Departments where these are required.
- • Consult with Office of Financial Aid re Work Study data
- • Sustain open communications with other subcommittees, especially First Year Experience (already met with chair), to solicit feedback from relevant groups/stakeholders not at meetings
- • Consult with LAC subcommittee, identify intersections and opportunities for synergy across areas and programs
- • Report feedback to committee to inform gaps

4. What recommendations, if any, have been determined to date?

Active Learning, as expressed across the five areas outline above, is not an add on, or an elective, but should be an expectation and an integral part of the university's academic portfolio and the educational experience for ALL undergraduate and graduate students.

- • Office of Engagement can lead, facilitate and assist implementation and assessment of this work, if resourced appropriately
  - o Create a menu of active learning options available to all students - centralized info
  - o Major experience tied to curriculum
  - o Departments/colleges establish criteria for HIP experience
- • Use existing systems (like Handshake, UNC Engaged Learning Portal) widely
- • Fully enroll UNIV 101
  - o Provide resources (small investment now) to support engagement & research
  - o Invest and expand offering to all incoming students
  - o Can be college specific -> introduce discipline expectations for research &
  - o engagement
  - o Accountability through UNIV 101 office
  - o Include as LAC requirement
- • Recognition of need for common language and shared expectations
  - o Clarify what Active Learning and HIP entails and outline in course catalog for students and faculty to understand
  - o Emphasis on responsibility of programs, professors, employers to outline/identify specific standards, framed by guidelines that the subcommittee develops, so students are informed and motivated to participate
  - o i.e. What will this internship consist of, what qualifies as study aboard, etc.

5. Please provide any additional information or comments.

Access to a general calendar of subcommittee meeting times/locale

- All internships and on-campus employment opportunities should be listed on Handshake to ensure equal opportunity for all students.
- Handshake is capable of managing a work flow process to approve internships for credit (faculty approve)
- The empirically demonstrated efficacy of community-engaged research, teaching and learning for student retention and success suggests this modality as an apex experience within the active learning portfolio.

Return to Contents

Graduate Programs Interim Task Force Report

Task Force:	Academic Portfolio
Committee:	Graduate Programs
Committee Chair(s):	Linda Black/Eugene Sheehan
Date:	Oct 22, 2018

Please provide a brief update on your committee's progress by responding to the four questions below.

1. What are the issues/questions your committee worked on during the reporting period?

- Defined our task relative to the charge
- Recognized the gravity of the work
- Use a campus-wide perspective
- Discussed metrics
- Discussed process
- How to recommend programs for closure/restructure

2. What data or other information have you used (numbered or bulleted list is fine)?

Committee will review

EAB report on Program Review

How other universities have dealt with financial crises and campus-wide program review

Three-year profile of program enrollments and targets

SCHR for last three years

Research and grant writing productivity

Other data as available, e.g., time to degree completion/program

Other contextual information as appropriate

3. What action steps are planned for the next reporting period?

Four deliverables:
Metrics to evaluate programs
Process to use metrics
Connect with Undergrad committee and Extended Campus Committee
(Recommended list for program closures)

4. What recommendations, if any, have been determined to date?

None -- working on metrics

5. Please provide any additional information or comments.

The committee has grown from a handful to 11. We are having vigorous conversations about metrics.

Return to Contents

Extended Campus Interim Task Force Report

Task Force:	Academic Portfolio
Committee:	Extended Campus
Committee Chair(s):	Nancy Rubin and Kiki Gilderhus
Date:	Monday, October 22, 2018

Please provide a brief update on your committee's progress by responding to the four questions below.

1. What are the issues/questions your committee worked on during the reporting period?

- What is the mission of the Extended Campus (as it exists)?
- What should the mission be moving forward?
- Why do we offer the programs we do (our existing inventory)? Is it the right mix?
- Which programs are profitable? What metrics should we use to determine?
- Is the existing model of cohorts and coordinators for each cohort meeting the needs of students and is it sustainable or should we move to a programmatic model (yearly projections with specific intake periods)
- Why do profitable programs not keep any percentage to reinvest?

2. What data or other information have you used (numbered or bulleted list is fine)?

- Reports from EAB (new program development and program portfolio review)
- ExC Cohort Spreadsheet (list of existing programs and cohorts within)
- Staffing and Coordination for each program

3. What action steps are planned for the next reporting period?

- Decide on a set of metrics to use for program evaluation
- How does program portfolio review committee work overlap with ExC program inventory review?
- What is the right inventory of programs for ExC?
  - Undergrad
  - Grad
  - Certificate
  - Professional Development
  - Dual Enrollment
- Surface certain strategic decisions to Deans/Provost/President for consideration and advice

4. What recommendations, if any, have been determined to date?

- Determine minimum thresholds for programs/cohorts to be profitable and decide on a course of action for those that do not.
- Decide if programs could run online through main campus as opposed to run through ExC.

5. Please provide any additional information or comments.

Other considerations –
Campus and center locations, programs offered at each location
Professional Development – growth opportunity
Business Partnerships
Dual Enrollment (High School students growing population – how do we incentivize them to matriculate at UNC?)

Return to Contents

Academic Program Support Interim Task Force Report

Task Force:	Academic Portfolio
Committee:	Subgroup H – Academic Support
Committee Chair(s):	Paul Bobrowski and Helen Reed
Date:	October 22, 2018

Please provide a brief update on your committee's progress by responding to the four questions below.

1. What are the issues/questions your committee worked on during the reporting period?

We have two charges: staffing levels and inefficiencies.
- Concerning staffing levels, we clarified with Provost Kalikow that the Task Force is to focus on state classified and professional exempt staff, not faculty, in the academic units. With that focus, the group talked about responsibilities of staff in the academic program areas, e.g. scheduling, faculty support, hiring, TAs, etc. The next step was to specify data that would be needed to cross-tabulated with staffing levels and responsibilities in order to understand the population served in each unit (e.g. number of faculty, number of majors, etc. (see below for next steps.)

- The second charge was to look at where there are inefficiencies in processes. A subgroup of Task Force members identified several potential areas where inefficiencies result in slow execution/unnecessary delays, duplication of efforts, lost opportunities – such as faculty candidate not hired in a timely manner, lost revenue, overtime, lack of training prior to introduction of new processes, high levels of approval, etc.

2. What data or other information have you used (numbered or bulleted list is fine)?

Data for staffing levels and scope of work:
- Susan Simmers developed a format for a report of summary data for each academic unit to include total number of staff (see attached) and then broken out down to the department/program level. This summary data will be compiled for each academic area.
- Another report format was developed showing each staff member in each academic area with pertinent data such as funding source. This report will serve as the basis for data gathering on staff responsibilities across the colleges.   Not only will this provide the level of potential savings of state funds, it will also determine the scope of work a staff member can and cannot perform.
- A list of possible staff responsibilities and duties was compiled. This will be compiled into a survey to be sent to each college to complete for each staff member. The survey results will provide information on the scope of work across the individuals in each area.
- A list of data elements which are indicators of the scope of departments/program areas were identified that will include a variety of measures indicating magnitude and complexity of the organization. Items to include but are not limited to student credit hours, number of courses, number of FT faculty, adjuncts, and GAs, number of majors, number of minors, etc. The magnitude and complexity of the unit can be cross-tabulated with the number of staff and scope of work to fulfill the subgroup's charge related to ideal staffing levels.

3. What action steps are planned for the next reporting period?

Prior to the next reporting period:
- The Task Force will gather and compile data regarding work carried out by staff across academic units including scope of work and levels of responsibilities. This will enable a comparison across units of work scope and work load; data will be assessed for identification of possible areas where consolidation of duties might provide more effective, streamlined workflows and utilization of staff resources.
- The Task Force will assess the list of processes where there may be gains and efficiencies. The Task Force will develop some sort of prioritization and/or combination to identify the most impactful processes to recommend changing in order to gain maximal efficiencies.

4. What recommendations, if any, have been determined to date?

5. Please provide any additional information or comments.

Return to Contents