University of Missouri-St. Louis
Program Prioritization Committee

Final Report

March 22, 2018

1. Introduction

The University of Missouri–St. Louis is reviewing its academic programs as part of a four-campus initiative designed to ascertain our programmatic areas of growth, strength and excellence to help guide, among other things, future distribution of resources. This process has the potential to transform UMSL into a model institution customized to serve metropolitan populations, communities, and businesses. The Program Prioritization Committee was charged with identifying those programs that are already well known and which we should strengthen and support, and those programs that are on the rise and in which we should invest. The committee was also asked to recommend elimination or alteration of existing programs when appropriate. The review began in October 2017 and concluded in March 2018, and it included the analysis of quantitative and qualitative data about campus units, as well as numerous conversations with and input from the entire campus community. While the university's present fiscal circumstances were both a catalyst and a consideration in the process, the chief goal was to generate recommendations with the potential to strengthen educational, research and community engagement activities as outlined in the campus Strategic Plan and its Six Core Values and Five Compacts.
[http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/files/pdfs/umsl-strategic-plan-3-15-18.pdf]

2. Committee Formation

Provost Sobolik appointed Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies Chris Spilling to chair the Program Prioritization Committee. The committee members were comprised of faculty representing major academic units and University Senate/Assembly committees and an associate deans/director from each of the four largest colleges.

Committee Members

> **Christopher Spilling**, Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies (Chair)
> **Michael Bahr**, Director of Academic Programs, College of Education
> **Michael Elliott**, Associate Dean, College of Business Administration
> **Roberta Lavin**, Associate Dean, College of Nursing
> **Birgit Noll**, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
> **Natalie Bolton**, Associate Professor of Educational Psychology; Chair, Assessment of Educational Outcomes Committee, Faculty Senate
> **Theresa Coble,** Des Lee Endowed Professor of Experiential and Family Education; Member, Budget and Planning Committee, University Assembly
> **Jim Craig**, Associate Teaching Professor and Chair, Department of Veteran & Military Studies; Chair, Academic Advisory Committee, Faculty Senate
> **Gerald Gao**, Professor of Marketing; Member, Research Policy Committee, Faculty Senate
> **Frank Grady**, Professor and Chair, Department of English; Member, Curriculum and Instruction Committee, Faculty Senate
> **Lea-Rachel Kosnik**, Associate Professor of Economics; Member, Assessment of Educational Outcomes Committee, Faculty Senate

Linda Marks, Clinical Associate Professor of Optometry; Member, Curriculum and Instruction Committee, Faculty Senate
Jennifer Mishra, Associate Professor of Music; Member, Research Policy Committee, Faculty Senate
Joseph Pickard, Associate Professor of Social Work; Member, Faculty Senate
Marc Spingola, Associate Teaching Professor of Biology; Member, Assessment of Educational Outcomes Committee, Faculty Senate
Roxanne Vandermause, Associate Professor of Nursing; Member, Curriculum and Instruction Committee, Faculty Senate

3. Data Sources

A website [http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/review/index.html] was created to help inform and involve students, faculty and staff about the review process. It contains data on UMSL programs, a list of committee members, a link to unit five-year reports, FAQs (Appendix A) and a mechanism to ask questions of or make comments to the committee chair.

Quantitative data for AY 2014-2017 was collected and displayed using Tableau and made accessible via the web site. The Tableau data was displayed in six screens (Table 1).

Table 1.

Screen	Name	Contents	Source
1	Student Data	SCH delivery Majors, all levels Graduates, all levels	Institutional research
2	Faculty Data	TT, NTT and adjunct numbers, GTA/GRA numbers, staff numbers	Institutional research
3	Research Data	Annual scholarly activity Research expenditures	MyVita, ORA
4	Academic Analytics-Comparison	Department rankings vs. comparator institutions	Academic Analytics
5	Academic Analytics-Career Progression	Individual (anonymous)ratings by rank/career	Academic Analytics
6	Margin Data	Department net cost / cost per SCH	Institutional research, UM system

To supplement the quantitative data, units were asked to provide self-study documents of up to 10 pages based upon a rubric with 12 key criteria (Appendix B). Subsequently, subcommittees led by an associate dean visited each unit. During the meetings a standard series of questions were asked of the unit representatives (Appendix C). At the conclusion of the visits, the committees scored the unit according to the 12 criteria (Appendix D).

Based upon the full committee's review of the quantitative and qualitative data and the results of the interviews, one of the following actions was recommended for each unit.
- *Inactivation* - (typically based on declining/low enrollment; poor margin data; overlap with other units; market changes; insufficient faculty to sustain program)
- *Further review* - (typically based on recent program changes; distance from core mission of unit; low research productivity; too many degrees/emphasis areas; insufficient faculty to

sustain program; poor enrollment or margin data but good interdisciplinary potential, strong impact in community, or exceptional external funding)
- *Combination/Consolidation* - (typically based on insufficient faculty to sustain program, poor enrollment or margin data, or low research productivity, but good interdisciplinary potential, valuable general ed or specialty teaching, or strong campus service or community impact)
- *Strategic Investments* - (strong programs based on market potential, current student interest, selectivity, and research productivity)
- *Fine as is, no action needed* - (typically programs adequate to strong in margin data, research, and SCH at present moment)

The Committee found the unit presentations uniformly informative and thorough, and they frequently revealed specific histories that helped add important nuance to our understanding of the Tableau data. Throughout the visits, the committee members were impressed by the excellent work done by our colleagues across the campus, and by the creative and committed ways in which they contribute to the university's mission.

The Committee's charge was a difficult one, forced on us by the campus's present budget circumstances. Nevertheless, we tried to approach the task mindful of our own commitment to preserve the possibilities offered by a liberal arts education, on a campus whose motto is "We Change Lives."

4. Specific Unit Recommendations

For the margin summary the 2016 campus net margin without depreciation was used.

Department	Recommendation	Action Items	Rationale/Observations
University			SCH: 277,178 to 244,294 (-11.9%) UG majors: 9,316 to 8,078(-13.3%) Grad students: 2400 to 2232 (-7%) Doc students 574-617 (+7%)
		College of Arts and Sciences	
College		Consult with new dean	SCH: 156,836 to 131,077 (-16.4%) UG majors: 4,639 to 4,019 (-13.4%) Grad students: 464 to 405 (-12.7%) Doc students: 250-258 (+3%) Margin -$2,137K
Anthropology	Inactivation	• Teaching • Eliminate BA degree • Combine faculty into general social science unit • Maintain a minor, cultural diversity and Gen Ed courses • Look at material assets and determine optimal use or liquidation	• UG Majors : 65 to 56 (-14%) • SCH: 6,158 to 4,478 (-27%)-large decline • Margin: +$160K-good • This unit has been compromised by recent tenure decisions and resignations.
Art and Design	Further review	• Teaching and research intensive (creative works) • Need to develop a strategic direction emphasizing graphic design and one other area within one year • Review again in two years • Must reverse trend. • Strategic and curricular review to simplify program within a year • Consider a role for service to the university in combination marketing/communications	• UG Majors: 246 to 164 (-33%) • SCH: 6,653 to 4,398 (-34%)-large decline. • Margin: -$397K • Recently dropped Art History and changed name. • Needs time to see if new direction will work to attract new students. • Graphic design has growth potential.

Biology	Fine as is	• Research and teaching • There should be no further decline in TT faculty (possible invest). • Improve grant performance.	• UG Majors: 473 to 426 (-9.9%) • SCH: 11,496 to 10,216 (-11%) • Margin: -$770K • Overall large program. • Research expenditure low, but good MS and PhD production.
Biochem/Biotech	Fine as is		• Successful joint chemistry and biology program with negligible additional costs
Chemistry and Biochemistry	Further review	• Research and teaching • Increase freshman enrollment • Faculty size needs to decrease by 1-2 positions (in select areas) based on current majors and SCH production. • Need to rehire technicians to support equipment in service centers (possible centralization under ORA). • Increase research expenditures	• Majors: 105 to 85 (-19%) Steady before 2017. • SCH: 7,574 to 6,059 (-20%) • Margin: -$1300K • Strong research expenditure and publication record. • Good MS and PhD production.
Communication and Media Studies	Inactivate (MA) Further review (BA)	• Teaching • Move media lab from Grand Center to campus. • Streamline and modernize course offerings to be attractive to students • Close MA program • Reverse decline in Comm SCH and majors	• Majors: 449 to 329 (26.7%) large decline • MA students 14 (12 spring 18) • SCH: 13,446 to 10,894 (-20%) • Margin: +$2000K • Very small graduate program
Criminology and Criminal Justice	Fine as is	• Research and teaching • Scale faculty proportional to undergraduate program. If the UG program continues to decline then so should the number of faculty.	• Majors: 484 to 342 (-29%) • SCH: 10,443 to 7,285 (-31%) • Large declines in major/SCH • Margin: $-115K • Strong research program. • Strong research expenditures (FY2017) • Highly ranked in academic

			analytics
Economics	Further review	• Research and teaching • Continue to grow data analytics and actuarial services • Continue to work on pathways to increase enrollment • Continue to work on changes that have been initiated	• Majors: 81 to 58 (-28%) • SCH: 7192 to 5799 (-19%) a little greater than the A&S decline. • Decline in majors a concern • Margin: -$425K • Losing money in UG and Grad • Research productive in the 85% (academic analytics) • Have made efforts to add new programs
English	Strategic investment	• Teaching and research (creative works) • Strategic hire in African American Literature relative to inclusive excellence.	• Majors: 144-104 (-28%) • SCH: 14653 to 12,190 (-17%) Declining credit hours are consistent with the college average • Margin: +$162K, great at UG level • MA (33) and MFA (29) declined from 100 total in 2014 • When looking at the national trend, majors and degrees are not declining as steeply • The market for African-American Lit PhDs is particularly rich at this time
History	Further review	• Teaching and research • Increase credit hours per faculty member or decrease the number of faculty (right size faculty) • Consider replacing outgoing faculty with someone in digital history • Reduce cost at the graduate level • Review in two years and determine the	• Major 89 to 92, fairly steady • SCH 5760 to 3,933 (-32%) declining, more than the average especially for the number of faculty • Margin: -$549K • Improving MA (41 to 56) • There are a respectable

		• reasons for current cost • Increase UG credit hours	number of graduate certificates
Language and Cultural Studies	Fine as is	• Teaching • Chair should have a two-course release • Course release for section coordinators • to work on growing UG program	• Majors 72 to 55 (-24%) • SCH 8,893 to 6,708 (-25%) declined more than the university average • Margin +$574K • This is an active group that has written some grants despite it not being a requirement for NTTs
Math and Computer Science	Further review (Math) Strategic Investment (Computer Science)	• Teaching and research • Leadership should ensure that computer technology degree is moved to system immediately. • Cybersecurity and computer technology need to be their first priorities. We recommend investment in these new programs, but not until the program proposal paperwork has reached MDHE. • Increase external research expenditures. • Senior faculty not producing research at the expected level should teach more and take the load of productive junior faculty. • GTAs should be decreased. • Convert some adjunct faculty to NTT positions to improve retention in math courses. • Eliminate PhD (math) if doesn't increase graduates and external funding • Reorient PhD to computer science	• Majors 354 to 466 (+32%, combined) • SCH20,892 to 21,503(+3%) Good enrollment • Margin: +$2380K • Research expenditure is poor. • Scholarly article numbers aren't good for the number of faculty • Academic Analytics is poor • The potential for enrollment growth is substantial if we get a cybersecurity degree. • Consider whether it would benefit the campus to split Math/CS into separate departments.
Military and	Combine/Consolidate	• Teaching	• This program is important for

Veterans Studies		• Move into new Social Sciences department • Keep the veterans' center linked to the new unit	recruiting veterans and has improved our profile. • It is a minor only and being part of a major would provide structure and growth

Music	Further review	• Teaching and research (creative works)
		• Look at margin data and determine what can be done such as exploring revenue generating events
		• Look at online delivery format and explore potential online offerings
		• Develop a strategic plan/direction and review in one year.
		   ○ Cutting or consolidating (with COE?) Master's program
		   ○ Streamlining curriculum and refining the branding to focus on UMSL-specific mission and strengths
			• Majors 113 to 104 (-8%)
			• SCH 3,646 to 3,963 (+9%) increased, but under 4,000
			• Margin: -$1200K (poor)
			• Decline in masters (20 to4)
			• There is a marketing issue. Music can generate recruitment across campus.
			• World class musicians on campus that aren't being effectively utilized for recruitment/advancement

Philosophy	Fine as is	• Teaching and research • Areas for potential growth are bioethics with life sciences and nursing	• Majors 31 to 27, steady but small • SCH 8,375 to 6,083 (-27%) decline is above average • Margin +$789K (good) • The MA is small (17) • 96 percentile for research (AA)
Physics	Further review	• Teaching and research • Reduce tracks in the undergraduate major and identify areas of strength in UG program • Concentrate departmental research focus to guide potential future hires	• Majors 54 to 42 (-22%) • SCH 6,578 to 5,143(-20%) decline slightly higher than CAS average • Margin +$135K • Small size of MS/PhD (4 & 16) programs are a concern, though margin data is good

Political Science	Combine/consolidate/ inactivate	• Teaching and research • This program should be merged into MPPA to create a new department of public policy. • The new unit should emphasize public policy at all levels • Focus on UG program and curriculum design and teaching; • Inactivate PhD program or reorient towards PPA degree only • Eliminate the GTA budget due to the limited number of credit hours taught. • Bring in outside reviewer to advise on structure of new unit • Faculty numbers should be scaled to size of UG & MA programs	• Majors 135 to 95 (-30%) • SCH 3,628 to 3,428 (-6%) • Margin -$1010K (poor) • Poor graduation rates /progression at PhD level • Low SCH for faculty size • No external funding • Highly ranked by academic analytics
Psychological Sciences	Further Review	• Teaching and Research • Develop an MA program that is fee paying (HR, I/O, neuro behavioral?), which will help offset cost of PhD program & potentially restore I/O PhD • Establish stronger connection with MIMH (joint appointments?)	• Majors 553 to 520 (-6%) • SCH 13,640 to 12,046 (-12%) • Margin -$561K • Research expenditures have declined sharply for department faculty • PhD programs highly rated in Academic Analytics

Sociology, Gerontology, Gender Studies	Combine/Consolidate	• Teaching
		• Include this department in a new Social Sciences/Sociology department that could include:
		  o Sociology BA/BS
		  o Gerontology MA
		  o Gerontology UG certificate (or eliminate)
		  o MVS minor
			• Margin -$17K
			• Consolidation will facilitate interdisciplinary inquiry and collaboration for small departments that will otherwise have difficulty sustaining themselves going forward

		- Anthro minors and certs - GS UG certificate - GS Grad certificate - Eliminate Gerontology director - Establish single unit structure (consider colocation, shared fiscal officer, merged budgets - Review curriculum to sort out and streamline its various majors and certificates - Scrutinize all potential degree/cert programs	
Theatre and Cinema Arts	Inactivate	- Integrate TT faculty into other units (Media Studies, Art & Design) - Explore options to continue theatre arts on campus that aren't tied to an academic program - Retain Gen Ed courses (e.g. Fundamentals of Acting)	- Major 34 to 20 (very small) - SCH 1,836 to 1,045 (-43%) poor per FTE ratio - Margin -$270K - Program is losing too much money per credit hour; poor margin data
College of Business Administration			
College			SCH 42,744 to 42,149 (-1.2%) UG majors: 2199 to 2043 (-7%) Grad students: 458 to 526 (+15%) Doc students: 21 to 10 (-52%) Margin +$3.4M
Accounting	Fine as is	Teaching and research	- Majors: 569 to 465 (-18%) - SCH 7,739 to 7,424 (-4%) decreased slightly - Margin: +473K - Number of master's degrees is increasing - Instruction is a particular strength - Excellent CPA pass rates

Finance and Legal Studies	Fine as is	• Teaching and research	• Majors 273 to 274, steady • SCH: 5,681 to 4,837 (-15%) dropped in past two years • Margin: +$183K • Productive researchers • Graduate program is growing
Global Leadership and Management	Fine as is	• Teaching and research	• Majors 297 to 269 (-9%) • SCH 6,354 to 6,163 (-3%) • Margin +$813K • Undergraduate margins are positive • Research productive unit
Information Systems	Fine as is (strategic investment)	• Teaching and research • Cybersecurity needs to be their first priorities. We recommend investment in this new program, but not until the program proposal paperwork has reached MDHE. • Increase external research expenditures.	• Majors 206 to 229 (+11%) • SCH 6,747 to 7,892 (+17%) • Margin +$875K
International Business	Undergraduate program— Fine as is Graduate program—Strategic investment	• Teaching and research • Consider committing resources to marketing for recruiting of graduate students from Asian and Middle Eastern markets	• Majors151 to 145, steady • SCH 1,353 to 1,577 (14%) • Margin -$371K • Strategic Investment: Master's degree has potential for growth; cohorts are international students from Asia to this point (Note: Data on Degrees Awarded in Tableau are inaccurate—see IB report)
Marketing	Fine as is	• Teaching and research	• Majors 244 to 234 steady and

			• degrees are generally steady • SCH 5,118 to 5498 (+7%) steady • Margin: +202K • Research-productive department
Supply Chain and Analytics	Further review	• Teaching and research • Hire additional pre-tenured faculty members to replace retirements • Place a hold on admissions to PhD	• Majors 71 to 90 (+27%) • SCH 5,080 to 5,006 steady • Margin +$246K, graduate level are positive; will improve over the next two years with significant retirements. • Department has already changed curriculum to recruit more majors; Fall 2018 data indicate increase • Currently, department has high, steady SCHs and shows an upward trend in majors • Department is nationally ranked in the 2016 Rothkopf Rankings • Consistently productive research faculty in terms of publications and Academic Analytics SRI data • PhD progression is slow and enrollments are down
College of Education			
Education	Fine as is	• Teaching and research • Consolidate overlapping courses in education research with other units on campus such as psychology and social work • Over 50% adjunct in teacher education	• Majors 931 to 706 (-24%) • MS 1059 to 989 (-7%) • Doc 268 to 248 (-7%) • SCH 34,583 to 30,611 (-11%) • Margin +$1.8 million • Programmatically intertwined

		and should shift to more full-time faculty • EdD is a growth area but needs faculty to oversee scholarly projects • Review role of endowed professors. They should anchor programs at all levels – UG and graduate • Support growing leadership program • Review educational leadership program in two years	• Has in place a restructuring and ongoing evaluation process • Has reached significant efficiencies by offering courses students in multiple programs can take • Counseling is a growth area and has strong corporate support • The educational leadership program has been radically revised
College of Nursing			
Nursing	Strategic investment	• Teaching and research • Add GRA to support research • SIM lab should remain the #1 priority. • Change the ratio of NTT to TT faculty • Cluster hiring in area of research to increase research expenditures • Eliminate MSN and move to DNP • Examine part-time BSN program for elimination (Due to low NCLEX scores for this program)	• Majors 955 to 767 • MSN 193 to 113 • Doc 34 to 101 • stopped admitting to MSN 2 years ago, decline in RN-BSN • SCH: 18,279 to 17,258 (-5%) • Margin -$616K, Trending positive. Increase in fees will drive the margin data strongly positive • Aggressively working on streamlining and credit hours for several years • Will lose students without the sim lab so it should happen in 2019 at latest • Improving research funding
College of Optometry			
Optometry	Fine as is (currently, but concerning moving forward)	• Teaching • Develop a strategic plan to address competition and research	• Majors 172 to 168 • SCH 7,286 to 7,391 • Margin: Trending positive • (-152K)

			• Only optometry college in MO • The classrooms are in very bad shape and need work • Need to be concerned about the future • Currently not able to grow the program due to increasing competition nationwide • Lack of research • Only 2 TT faculty and no junior faculty that are TT. No longer recruiting TT faculty
College of Social Work			
Social Work	Fine as is	• Teaching and research • No further cuts • Partner with other programs on campus to offer courses	• Majors 316 to 327 • MSW 148 to 145 • SCH 6,354 to 6,626 • Margin +$467K, good and improving • Below the faculty/student ratio needed for accreditation • Good UG and Grad programs
Public Policy			
MPPA	Combine/Consolidate	• Teaching • See Political Science for action	• Masters 78 to 53 (includes certificate students) • SCH: 965 to 633 (-40% • Margin -$380K, poor • Strong MS program, but should not stand alone

5. General Recommendations

During the course of the discussion, several general recommendations which would impact multiple units or the University as a whole surfaced.

Recruitment/Retention

- Focus international recruiting where we have existing relationships. Form a multi-unit team of faculty and staff to enhance international relationships and recruiting.
- Increase freshmen enrollment.
- Establish that recruitment and retention are an essential responsibility of faculty, staff, and leadership.
- Marketing/Graphic Design/Media should work together to improve marketing of individual units across campus, many of which are looking for help in this area.
- Provide additional robust tutoring programs.
- Re-focus Endowed Positions to anchor high-enrollment programs and attract new students to campus.
- Strengthen UMSL NOW and expand in-state or domestic tuition rate for out-of-state and international online students.

Interdisciplinary & Curricular

- Restructure general education offerings across campus via collaborative scheduling to reduce competition.
- Encourage units to streamline curricula to map out efficient paths to graduation.
- Incentivize cross-utilization of courses between programs (eg. Bachelor of Educational Studies).
- Establish more 3+2 programs.
- Maximize courses that can be shared across degrees at the graduate level.

Facility use

- Consolidate like units via co-location to facilitate more efficient operations
- Touhill is an underused and under-funded resource on our campus. Use more for teaching? Marketing?
- Move Grand Center and other UMSL facilities to main campus to consolidate and cut costs. Do not offer classes there.

Other

- Review Honors College according to Program Prioritization criteria.

- Campus needs to take positive action to address low morale resulting from the current fiscal climate.
- Campus should assist units in tracking students after graduation (e.g. job and grad school placement).

Appendix A. FAQs from the Program Prioritization Website

Why are we undergoing a review of academic programs?
University of Missouri System President Mun Choi requested that each UM campus review its programmatic offerings in an effort to determine their excellence, centrality and potential for growth.

Are the reviews consistent across the campuses?
Each campus is approaching the process differently – including hiring external review firms – and might be seeking different outcomes. At UMSL, leaders felt the university had the assets available to conduct the review internally. The review at UMSL seeks to use the findings/recommendations to strengthen and tailor offerings that are best suited to our role as a public metropolitan research institution.

What is the committee charge?
The committee is charged with determining areas of growth, strength and excellence to help delineate programs that are already well known and in which we should strengthen and support, and those programs that are on the rise and in which we should invest. This broad charge will allow committee members to discuss and consider recommendations that will guide future resource allocation including to eliminate, add or alter existing programs.

What does it mean to guide future resource allocation?
The future strength of our university is determined by where we allocate current resources. Investing in our areas of growth, strength and excellence will maintain UMSL as an essential regional asset that helps drive the economy, engages with our community, and produces an educated citizenry. In times of budgetary shortfalls, we undermine our areas of strength when we cut uniformly rather than strategically.

What do you mean eliminate, add or alter?
Following its analyses, the committee might recommend some programs be eliminated or phased out due to lack of demand or adequate resources while other programs could be added to meet demand or grow areas of excellence. Additionally, the committee might recommend some programs should be research intensive and others undergraduate/teaching intensive, or that some programs might do both.

Could this lead to a review of the tenure process or hiring process?
This review will not lead to a change in the tenure process, but might determine where hiring occurs and possibly whether hiring will be tenure track or non-tenure track.

Who will approve the final recommendations?
The entire campus community will have access to programmatic data and can participate in discussions with committee members. The final recommendations will be developed by the committee and submitted to the provost.

What will be done with the final recommendations?
The final recommendations will help guide academic affairs decisions with regards to hiring, programmatic development and resource allocations by the end of this fiscal year and moving forward. The chancellor, CFO and academic deans will be greatly involved in these implementation decisions.

Appendix B. The Rubric Sent to Units Leaders to Guide the Self Report.

Academic Program Prioritization Process

As part of a four-campus initiative designed to ascertain our programmatic areas of growth, strength and excellence, UMSL is conducting a Program Prioritization exercise of its academic programs to help guide, among other things, future distribution of resources. Dr. Christopher Spilling, Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies, Chair of the Program Prioritization Committee, has appointed four teams comprised of faculty members. One of the teams will review and visit each UMSL program/unit. The teams have reviewed quantitative data for their assigned units and will now begin visiting chairpersons (and faculty) to obtain qualitative data via program visits.

The quantitative data are available to the University community and are found in a Tableau site organized by Institutional Research that includes 6 Tabs summarizing information for each program over the past 4 years. (Click on this link to go the Academic Affairs website and then scroll down to log into Tableau.) The Committee will use the quantitative data in addition to the qualitative data obtained from discussions with each program and with our campus community to develop their recommendations.

To guide discussions during team visits with their assigned units, we are asking chairpersons or program leaders to provide information on the 12 Key Criteria . The Key Criteria are listed Part I of this document, and they include Indicators. Please review the indicators for each criterion and select those that are most relevant to discussing the particular criterion. Your report should explain how well the indicators are met, and it should be double-spaced, not exceeding 10 pages, excluding appended material or data.

Part II of this document requests that you list the names of faculty, including adjuncts, and staff members in your program and their FTE contribution.

Due Date Feb 9th.

Submit to cspill@umsl.edu

Program Prioritization Report Outline

Part I: Report Using Key Criteria and Indicators

Key Criteria	Indicators
1. **Mission of the Unit/Program**	• Mission of the unit • Alignment with UMSL institutional mission • Alignment with UMSL proposed Strategic Plan and its five compacts
2. **History, Development, and Expectations**	• Historical enrollment patterns • Consideration for full-time students vs. part-time students • Relationship to labor market trends/demand • State requirements • Extent to which program is "core" to the educational experience • Employer feedback
3. **External Demand**	• National and state policy/economic projections • Placement data • Labor market projections • Enrollment levels • Whether program supports majors and minors and/or other programs • Professional credentials from approved state or national licensing agencies (e.g., license, certification)
4. **Internal Demand**	• Courses delivered • Student credits generated • Student academic profile • Minors, certificates
5. **Program Inputs and Processes**	• Program review data • Quality of faculty and staff • Amount of, and quality of, instruction offered by full-time faculty • Amount of, and quality of, instruction offered by part-time faculty • Quality of students attracted to program • Quality of curriculum—breadth, depth, and level of the discipline • Equipment, technology, and facilities

	• Graduate satisfaction • Graduation rates • Overall quality of continuous improvement processes in place • Please provide evidence
6. Program Outcomes	• Job placement and success • External credentials obtained by graduates (i.e., pass rates on state/national exams, licensure, certification, etc.) • Employer satisfaction • Ratio of students to faculty • Enrollments • Contribution to institutional reputation • National accreditation • State accreditation • Please provide evidence
7. Size, Scope, and Productivity	• Average section sizes at particular levels • Graduation rates • Program-allocated resources • Degrees offered • Degrees granted
8. Advancement and Other Resources Generated	• Other revenue • Special program fee income • Endowment/scholarships • Fundraising/advancement
9. Cost of Program	• Salaries of faculty, staff, TAs, GRAs • Capital expenses, and equipment • Operating expenses
10. Impact, Justification and Overall Essentiality	• Degree to which program is "mission critical" • Other measures of institutional value • New program opportunity • Program responsiveness to address external needs at the local, state, or national level • Impact on community—business, educational, medical, civic, and social agency partnerships • Program responsiveness to address internal university need
11. Opportunity Analysis	• Alternative delivery mechanisms • Potential for interdisciplinary programs • Opportunity to realign or strengthen program • Steps taken for cost containment, if applicable

12. Scholarly Activity and Grants	• Grants • Contracts • Articles • Books • Conference proceedings • Invited presentations • Contributed presentations • Patents • Disclosures • Licenses • Royalties/income stream

Part II: Faculty and Staff Information

Name of Unit/Program:

Name of Person(s) Completing Report: **Date:**

Please list the names of all current faculty (including adjuncts) and staff members in your department/program and their FTE contribution.

Name of Faculty/Staff Member	FTE	Comments
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.		
17.		

Note: Add additional rows, if needed.

Appendix C. A Typical Agenda and Standard Questions Used for the Sub-Committee Visits to Units

Meeting Agenda with Departments

1. Introductions
2. Explanation of Academic Program Prioritization
3. Review of Data
4. Discussion of 12 Criteria
5. Summary of Key Takeaways

Explanation of Academic Program Prioritization

- The four-campus initiative is designed to ascertain areas of growth, strength and excellence. Due to the financial challenges our campus faces, we are charged with making recommendations ranging from investment to inactivation.

- The Provost has charged our group with conducting an examination of departments and programs across campus. We use a two-pronged approach: review/reconcile the Tableau data and conduct interviews with chairs and key departmental faculty.

- While reading your report, we learned about the excellent work done by your faculty, staff, and students in classrooms, labs and studios. Personally, I have a renewed appreciation for the outstanding work occurring in the _____ department. Through this review process, we hope to find opportunities for future innovation and growth.

- In this meeting, we'll discuss your department's mission and vision, review the Tableau data found in the Program Prioritization website and the 12 key Criteria outlined in your departmental report. Many of our questions will be designed to allow you to elaborate on your department's operations. Some of our questions may challenge some long-standing assumptions and conclusions. Finally, we want to find solutions your department can implement to better align itself with the campus' mission.

- After this meeting, our review team will convene and assess your department's role in reaching the campus' strategic goals.

- President Choi has requested that UMSL provide program recommendations by mid-March

Review of Data (possible questions)

- Do you have additional information that might be relevant in reviewing the tableau data?
- Were you able to reconcile the academic analytics data? Was the information in the academic analytics and MyView consistent?
- What other data did you consider or use?

Discussion of 12 Criteria

1. Mission of the Unit/Program

     a. How does your mission align with the compacts: community engagement; inclusiveness; excellence in planning/operations/stewardship; student success; research and creative works

2. History, Development, and Expectations
   a. What evidence exists that student employment improves under your program?
   b. What employment trends has your program specifically addressed?
   c. How can your program take advantage of UMSLNOW?
3. External Demand
   a. What are the emerging professions in your field?
   b. What initiatives (camps, recruitment trips, etc.) are underway to increase demand for your programs among HS students
   c. What interdisciplinary opportunities exist for your department?
   d. What opportunities exist for non-degree programs in your field at UMSL
   e. Are there any external trends in the microenvironment (e.g., technology, political, legal, etc.) that would positively impact your major?
4. Internal Demand
   a. Opportunities for new courses to increase demand?
   b. Which programs or courses have struggled to gain traction?
   c. What would facilitate student demand (e.g. more online, evening courses, scholarships, support services)?
5. Program Inputs and Processes
   a. Is the mix of full and part-time faculty sustainable? In what ways would the loss of full time faculty affect your program's prestige and/or accreditation
   b. In your opinion, are admission standards appropriate for your target student?
   c. Which part of your department needs reinvestment? As a trade-off, which part(s) of your department could be reduced or eliminated?
   d. In the past few years, what has been the most productive assets acquired.
   e. What departmental efforts have been the most successful in recruiting new students? Retaining current students?
   f. In what way (if any), has the reduction in staff affected departmental operations?
   g. Are there opportunities to consolidate courses, programs, clinics, labs, etc.
6. Programs Outcomes
   a. What evidence suggests that UMSL graduates in your field of study have a competitive advantage in the marketplace.
   b. Aside from enrollment trends shown in Tableau, how does your department's enrollments and majors compare to national trends?
   c. What is your department's major point of pride?
7. Size, Scope, and Productivity
   a. Over the past 10 years, how have cuts most affected your department?
   b. What student success strategies are you perusing to increase graduation rates?
   c. What strategies have been pursued to increase instructional productivity (e.g., increases class caps, TAs, cross-listings)
8. Advancement and other Resources Generated
   a. How sensitive are your students to tuition/fee increases?
   b. What new fundraising tactics have been considered?
   c. Have weekend or non-degree programs been considered?
9. Cost of Program
   a. To what extend has UMSL's salary structure been a deterrent in hiring top faculty?
   b. What creative approaches have been used to fund faculty research or travel to conferences?

      c. What have been the impacts of reduced TA funding on graduate student recruitment and retention?
10. Impact, Justification and Overall Essentiality
      a. Aside from your primary mission, what other ancillary benefits does your department provide the campus?
      b. What are long term community engagement possibilities?
11. Opportunity Analysis
      a. What would you consider "stretch" goals for your department over the next 10 years?
      b. What is the biggest threat that your department faces (aside from financial)?
12. Scholarly activities and grants
      a. How can you department "monetize" its efforts in these areas?

Takeaways

Appendix D. The Rubric Used to Score Units after the Sub-Committee Visits

Program Prioritization Rubric

Name of Unit/Program:

Name of Person(s) Completing Rubric: **Date:**

Part I: Rubric Ratings and Content

Key Criteria	Indicators	Comments	Rating
1. Mission of the Unit/Program	• Mission of the unit • Alignment with UMSL institutional mission • Alignment with UMSL proposed Strategic Plan and its five compacts		5-Very high 4-Moderately high 3-Average 2-Moderately low 1-Very low
2. History, Development, and Expectations	• Historical enrollment patterns • Consideration for full-time students vs. part-time students • Relationship to labor market trends/demand • State requirements • Extent to which program is "core" to the educational experience • Employer feedback		5-Very high 4-Moderately high 3-Average 2-Moderately low 1-Very low
3. External Demand	• National and state policy/economic projections • Placement data • Labor market projections • Enrollment levels • Whether program supports majors and minors and/or other programs • Professional credentials from approved state or		5-Very high 4-Moderately high 3-Average 2-Moderately low 1-Very low

	national licensing agencies (e.g., license, certification)		
4. Internal Demand	• Courses delivered • Student credits generated • Student academic profile • Minors, certificates		5-Very high 4-Moderately high 3-Average 2-Moderately low 1-Very low
5. Program Inputs and Processes	• Program review data • Quality of faculty and staff • Amount of, and quality of, instruction offered by full-time faculty • Amount of, and quality of, instruction offered by part-time faculty • Quality of students attracted to program • Quality of curriculum—breadth, depth, and level of the discipline • Equipment, technology, and facilities • Graduate satisfaction • Graduation rates • Overall quality of continuous improvement processes in place • Please provide evidence		5-Very high 4-Moderately high 3-Average 2-Moderately low 1-Very low
6. Program Outcomes	• Job placement and success • External credentials obtained by graduates (i.e., pass rates on state/national exams, licensure, certification, etc.) • Employer satisfaction • Ratio of students to faculty • Enrollments		5-Very high 4-Moderately high 3-Average 2-Moderately low 1-Very low

	• Contribution to institutional reputation • National accreditation • State accreditation • Please provide evidence		
7. Size, Scope, and Productivity	• Average section sizes at particular levels • Graduation rates • Program-allocated resources • Degrees offered • Degrees granted		5-Very high 4-Moderately high 3-Average 2-Moderately low 1-Very low
8. Advancement and Other Resources Generated	• Other revenue • Special program fee income • Endowment/scholarships • Fundraising/advancement		5-Very high 4-Moderately high 3-Average 2-Moderately low 1-Very low
9. Cost of program	• Salaries of faculty, staff, TAs, GRAs • Capital expenses, and equipment • Operating expenses		5-Very high 4-Moderately high 3-Average 2-Moderately low 1-Very low
10. Impact, Justification and Overall Essentiality	• Degree to which program is "mission critical" • Other measures of institutional value • New program opportunity • Program responsiveness to address external needs at the local, state, or national level • Impact on community—business, educational, medical, civic, and social agency partnerships • Program responsiveness to address internal university need		5-Very high 4-Moderately high 3-Average 2-Moderately low 1-Very low

11. Opportunity Analysis	• Alternative delivery mechanisms • Potential for interdisciplinary programs • Opportunity to realign or strengthen program • Steps taken for cost containment, if applicable		5-Very high 4-Moderately high 3-Average 2-Moderately low 1-Very low
12. Scholarly Activity and Grants	• Grants • Contracts • Articles • Books • Conference proceedings • Invited presentations • Contributed presentations • Patents • Disclosures • Licenses • Royalties/income stream		5-Very high 4-Moderately high 3-Average 2-Moderately low 1-Very low
		Sum of Rubric Ratings	