



THE UNIVERSITY *of*
NEW ORLEANS

Academic Program Restructuring Report

Submitted to:

University of Louisiana System Board of Supervisors

Submitted by:

Peter J. Fos, Ph.D., M.P.H., President

Date Submitted:

November 26, 2014

INTRODUCTION

The University of New Orleans is continually vigilant in ensuring the quality of academic programming and in providing the best possible educational experience for its students. Over the past two years the University of New Orleans has been engaged in review regarding accreditation, and completion of the compliance certification associated with reaffirmation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). This period of self-study and introspection has allowed the institution the opportunity to review all aspects of the University in order to confirm compliance with SACSCOC standards.

This process coincided with important budget considerations including significant state cuts and a need to “right size” the University to better align with enrollment figures which have been declining since 2009. With the exception of the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina (when the University declared financial exigency and eliminated programs in crisis mode without significant faculty input), the University of New Orleans has never gone through a comprehensive review of academic programs. Periodic evaluation of academic programs is critical to determine whether the University is meeting the needs of its constituents. University of Louisiana System policy FS-III.XV.B-1a (*Academic Program Discontinuance*) states: “Consistent with the goal of academic excellence, each university should adopt policies and procedures to provide for regular, periodic review of all academic programs.” Additionally, given the current fiscal climate in higher education and the long-term fiscal instability of the University of New Orleans, it is absolutely essential to act upon the assessment of academic

programs in order to ensure that the programs offered by the university are sustainable over time.

This report presents a summary of the process used to review academic programs and my recommendations to the University of Louisiana System Board of Supervisors. The work began in June 2012, led by former Interim Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs Dr. Louis Paradise as a result of an \$8.9M reduction in state appropriations in the 2012-13 budget. This work continued under the guidance of former Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs Dr. James Payne. However, these efforts were conducted through the Dean's Council without significant input from faculty. University of Louisiana System policy FS-III.XV.B-1a states: "Occasionally, for educational and/or budgetary reasons, it may be in the university's best interest to discontinue an academic program. Such a decision should be made after consultation with appropriate faculty groups ..."

In March 2014, in cooperation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the officers of the Faculty Council, I established a Faculty Governance Committee to assist me by providing advice and recommendations concerning issues that affect faculty. This report is a result of the work of the Faculty Governance Committee, evaluation by the Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs Dr. Richard Hansen, and my own evaluation. During my evaluation I seriously considered the recommendations from the Faculty Governance Committee and the Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

This report is organized as follows: a) description of the process used by the Faculty Governance Committee, b) recommendations of the Faculty Governance Committee, c) recommendations of the Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs, and d) my recommendations. This report also will present the timeline for restructuring, which will occur in three phases.

Phase 1 focuses on immediate discontinuation of a set of academic programs, as well as other recommendations which affects the fiscal health of the University of New Orleans. Phase 2 will include a review of a second set of programs in spring 2015 to identify opportunities to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of program operation. The programs to be reviewed in Phase 2 were recently identified by the Faculty Governance Committee as programs in need of restructuring or significant modification in order to promote sustainability. It is projected that the Phase 2 review will also identify some academic programs that will be discontinued or restructured significantly. Phase 3 will take place in fall 2015 and will focus on all remaining programs of study offered at the University of New Orleans. This review will identify strategies to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of these programs which were recently identified by the faculty committee as the most viable of the degrees currently offered.

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

University policy clarifies the role of the faculty in relation to other constituencies regarding critical aspects operating the institution, including the development of curricula. The fundamental importance of the role of faculty is underscored by a statement included in Section 2.0 of the Employee Handbook (page 29):

A faculty is preeminently responsible for the definition, quality, and character of a university. The faculty body is responsible for the development and delivery of curricula and for the institution's record of scholarly contributions.

Section 3.3 of the Employee Handbook describes faculty authority to determine educational policy:

Authority to determine the educational policy of the University of New Orleans – its colleges, schools, and departments is delegated to the faculty by the Board of Supervisors. The faculty exercises this authority by deliberative action in all units and divisions of the University.

The faculty has the authority to establish curricula, fix standards of instruction, and determine requirements for degrees, and make recommendations for the granting of degrees through its respective colleges. It has legislative power over its own meetings and may delegate its own authority to the Faculty Senate and/or to other standing committees. The faculty's authority is limited to matters proper to the faculty, and the UNO President or the University of Louisiana System President may suspend any faculty action that is deemed administrative in nature or which seriously affects the interests of another faculty of the university or of the system.

The University of New Orleans faculty generally exercises its authority over educational policy through the Faculty Senate and its committees and through departmental, college-level and campus-level committees on courses and curricula.

In accordance with University of New Orleans policy, the Faculty Governance Committee was formed in March 2014 as a mechanism to implement a collaborative initiative between the University administration and the faculty. Membership of the Committee is shown in Appendix I. The committee's charge is to provide advice and recommendations to the President and the University administration on issues affecting faculty.

The first task was development of a Faculty Workload Policy. The Committee rather quickly developed a policy and recommended it to the Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President. As President, I have accepted the Committee's recommended Faculty Workload

Policy. The second task of the Committee was developing a faculty evaluation process that was based on faculty performance and productivity. Additionally, at the same time the Faculty Governance Committee was asked by the Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs to conduct a review of academic programs. Given the complexity and importance of the review of academic programs, the Faculty Governance Committee decided to postpone their work on Faculty Evaluation.

The purpose of the program review initiative is to identify specific areas where the University can reduce expenditures by eliminating ineffective programs of study and revising the programs of study that will remain in the University of New Orleans curriculum to improve effectiveness and efficiency. Funds saved as a result of program discontinuations will be used to balance the University budget and to strategically re-invest in targeted programs with growth potential. The purpose of the restructuring and revitalization plan is to strengthen academic programs, ultimately making the University a more efficient and effective university for students and to improve the alignment of the university with business, industry, and community needs. The Faculty Governance Committee worked diligently, meeting every week, to review academic programs. Appendix II presents the Committee's timeline of work.

The work to identify programs for closure and revitalization was based on three major considerations: 1) university mission, 2) SACSCOC standards, and 3) the University of New Orleans Strategic Plan, *UNO 2020*.

The Faculty Governance Committee used six criteria to evaluate academic programs by weighting the criteria and developing scores for each program. The six criteria were: a) external demand; b) internal demand; c) size, scope, and productivity; d) quality of inputs and outputs; e) revenue; f) impact, justification, essentiality. Appendix III presents the report from the Faculty Governance Committee. The report highlights the criteria that were used in reviewing academic programs and their weights. Based on the scoring, the Faculty Governance Committee placed each academic program in one of four categories: 1) **enhance**, 2) **sustain**, 3) **restructure, merge, or otherwise transform**, or 4) **close**. The assignment of categories was based on dividing the program scores into quartiles. The Faculty Governance Committee utilized a voting process to make final assignment of all programs of study to one of the four categories.

The Faculty Governance Committee has recommended three programs for immediate closure. These programs are: B.S. in Early Childhood Education, B.S. in Elementary Education – Integrated/Merged Approach, and Ph.D. in Political Science. The Faculty Governance Committee also recommended that 25 academic programs undergo a process of creating new operating models. These programs were placed in *Category 3: Restructure, Merge, or Otherwise Transform*.

The Faculty Governance Committee further recommended that the academic programs in *Category 3* be required to develop plans describing their restructuring, which will be reviewed by the Committee. Expected results of this planning are merged programs, re-focus of programs on high demand sub-disciplines, cross-discipline collaborations, development of

certificate programs, and discontinuance of academic programs. The planning process will end in May 2015, and the Faculty Governance Committee will submit their recommendations to the University administration no later than May 31, 2015.

INTERIM VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Dr. Richard Hansen, Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, served as an ex-officio member of the Faculty Governance Committee. He was very involved with the academic program review process and had the opportunity to evaluate the report from the Faculty Governance Committee to the University administration. Dr. Hansen submitted a report to me which includes the recommendations presented by the Faculty Governance Committee, as well as his additional recommendations (see Appendix IV). His recommendations are as follows:

1. Discontinue the B.S. in Early Childhood Education (low enrollment and changes in the State of Louisiana add-on certification regulations do not require university coursework);
2. Discontinue the B.S. in Elementary Education – Integrated/Merged Approach (low enrollment and low completers over a 3 year period);
3. Discontinue the M.Ed. in Special Education -- create a single M.Ed. program in Teaching and Learning in collaboration with the existing M.Ed. in Curriculum & Instruction (low enrollment and low completers over a 3 year period);
4. Discontinue the Ph.D. in Special Education – create a single Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning with the Ph.D. in Curriculum & Instruction (low enrollment and low completers over a 3 year period);
5. Discontinue the Ph.D. in Curriculum & Instruction – create a single Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning with the Ph.D. in Special Education (low enrollment and low completers over a 3 year period);
6. Eliminate the Department of Geography – the B.A. and M.A. academic programs were discontinued in May 2011 and the teach-out program is completed;

7. Discontinue the M.A. in Political Science – possibly create a concentration within a new M.A. in Social Sciences (low enrollment and low completers over a 3 year period);
8. Ph.D. in Political Science (low enrollment; on Louisiana Board of Regents list of targeted programs for low completers).
9. M.A. in Romance Languages (low enrollment); this program is targeted for discontinuance by the Louisiana Board of Regents.

The recommendations of the Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs results in the discontinuance of 6 programs, the merger of 2 programs, and the elimination of a department. These actions involve the elimination of 13 faculty positions and the reduction in adjunct faculty needs. The Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs also recommended the reduction in the adjunct faculty budget for the Spring 2015. Table 1 presents the projected fiscal savings that will result from the above recommendations.

The Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs also endorsed the recommendation of the Faculty Governance Committee to review programs in the *Category 3: Restructure, Merge, or Otherwise Transform*.

PRESIDENT’S RECOMMENDATIONS

Phase I

After receiving the recommendations from the Faculty Governance Committee (it is important to note that I served as an ex officio member of this committee) and the Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, I have reviewed data and participated in discussions with faculty, deans, and members of my Leadership Team. Please note that my recommendations are in three

phases, as I have previously outlined in Fiscal Stability reports I have submitted to the Fiscal Watch Subcommittee.

Table 1 Interim VPAA Recommendations

| Academic Program | Description | Savings AY 2014-15 | Savings AY 2015-16 | Savings AY 2016-17 |
|---|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Discontinue B.S. Early Childhood Education | Eliminate 1 faculty position | | \$73,370 | \$73,370 |
| Discontinue B.S. Elementary Education – Integrated/Merged | Reduce adjuncts | See below | | |
| Discontinue M.Ed. Spec. Ed. | Reduce adjuncts | See below | | |
| Discontinue Ph.D. Curriculum & Instruction | Reduce adjuncts | See below | | |
| Discontinue Ph.D. Spec. Ed. | Reduce adjuncts | See below | | |
| Eliminate Dept. of Geography | Eliminate 5 faculty positions | | \$499,226 | \$499,226 |
| Discontinue M.A. Political Science | Eliminate 2 faculty positions | | \$127,368 | \$127,368 |
| Discontinue Ph.D. Political Science | See M.A. | | | |
| Discontinue M.A. Romance Languages | Eliminate 4 faculty positions | | \$214,684 | \$214,684 |
| Spring Adjunct Faculty Budget | Reduce budget by 70% and assign courses to full-time faculty | \$999,639 | | |
| Total by Academic Year | 12 | \$999,639 | \$915,008 | \$915,008 |

Table 2 shows my recommendations for Phase I, the effect on faculty (number of positions eliminated or use of adjunct professors), fiscal savings for AY 2014-15 and AY 2015-16. My recommendations will result in the discontinuance of 7 academic programs, the elimination of one department, 22 faculty positions, and 4 staff positions. Additionally, I recommend a permanent reduction in the adjunct faculty budget of \$1,000,000 annually, and a required

minimum 2/2 course load for department chairs (several department chairs currently have a 1/1 course load). Below is an explanation for each recommendation:

1. Discontinue B.S. Early Childhood Education – low enrollment and low completers for the past 3 years – changes in State certificate regulations do not require university coursework; 1 professor of practice faculty position will be eliminated, with fiscal saving in AY 2015-16.
2. Discontinue M.Ed. in Special Education – low enrollment and low completers for the past 3 years; no faculty positions will be eliminated, but this will result in a reduction of adjunct faculty.
3. Discontinue Ph.D. in Special Education -- low enrollment and low completers for the past 3 years; no faculty positions will be eliminated, but this will result in a reduction of adjunct faculty.
4. Discontinue Ph.D. in Curriculum & Instruction -- low enrollment and low completers for the past 3 years; no faculty positions will be eliminated, but this will result in a reduction of adjunct faculty.
5. Eliminate the Department of Geography -- the B.A. and M.A. academic programs were discontinued in May 2011 and the teach-out program is completed; 5 faculty positions will be eliminated, with fiscal savings in AY 2015-16.
6. Discontinue M.A. and Ph.D. in Political Science -- low enrollment and low completers for the past 3 years; 2 faculty positions will be eliminated, with fiscal saving in AY 2015-16.
7. Discontinue M.A. in Romance Languages -- low enrollment and low completers for the past 3 years; 4 faculty positions will be eliminated, with fiscal savings in AY 2015-16.
8. Eliminate the 1/1 course load for department chairs – department chairs will be required to teach 2/2 loads, unless grants or contracts allow for buy-out for a portion of their salary -- this will result in less dependence on adjunct faculty.
9. Eliminate instructor positions – 10 instructor positions will be eliminated across campus; specific positions will be determined by the deans, with approval by the Provost and President, with fiscal savings in AY 2014-15.
10. Reduce adjunct faculty budget – this reduction will be \$1,000,000 per year beginning in Spring 2014; this will result in less dependence on adjunct faculty and additional courses to be taught by full-time.

11. Eliminate Earl K. Long Library staff – 4 staff positions will be eliminated to better align Library staff and budget with Louisiana Tech University.

Table 2 President’s Recommendations – Phase 1

| Recommendation | Faculty/Staff Position Reduction | Fiscal Savings AY 2014-15 | Fiscal Savings AY 2015-16 |
|--|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Discontinue B.S. Early Childhood Education | 1 | | \$73,730 |
| Discontinue M.Ed. Special Education | None/reduce adjuncts | See below | |
| Discontinue Ph.D. Curriculum & Instruction | None/reduce adjuncts | See below | |
| Discontinue Ph.D. Special Education | None/reduce adjuncts | See below | |
| Eliminate Dept. of Geography | 5 | | \$499,226 |
| Discontinue M. A. Political Science | 2 | | \$207,140 |
| Discontinue Ph.D. Political Science | See M.A. Political Science | | See M.A. Political Science |
| Discontinue M.A. Romance Languages | 4 | | \$214,000 |
| Minimum 2/2 course load for Dept. Chairs | Less dependence on adjuncts | | |
| Eliminate Instructor Positions | 10 | | \$550,000 |
| Reduce Adjunct Budget | | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 |
| Reduce Library Staff | 4 staff | | \$250,000 |
| Total | 26 | \$1,000,000 | \$2,794,096 |

Phase II

As was recommended by the Faculty Governance Committee, and endorsed by the Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs, I will allow programs in the *Category 3: Restructure, Merge, or Otherwise Transform*, to work on plans to restructure, merge, or otherwise transform until May 2015. Their plans will be submitted to the Faculty Governance Committee for review and recommendation will be submitted to the Provost and the President based on academic

program plans. It is expected that programs will merge, develop new operating models, or be recommended for discontinuance.

At this time it is difficult to precisely determine the effect on faculty and the fiscal health of the University of New Orleans, but it is reasonable to project that several efficiencies will be identified and implemented. However, Table 3 presents changes that can be expected which will have a fiscal health effect in AY 2016-17.

Table 2 Phase II Expectations

| Recommendation | Faculty/Staff Position Reduction | Fiscal Savings AY 2016-17 | Fiscal Savings 2016-17 |
|--|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Discontinue 5 academic programs | 5 | \$375,000 | \$375,000 |
| Merge 5 programs | None/reduce adjuncts | | |
| Eliminate Instructor Positions (result of merged programs) | 10 | \$550,000 | \$550,000 |
| Reduce Adjunct Budget | | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 |
| Totals | 15 | \$1,925,000 | \$1,925,000 |
| Grand Total Phase I & Phase II | 41 | \$4,719,096 | \$4,719,096 |

Phase III

A large number of existing programs offered at the University of New Orleans were identified by the Faculty Governance Committee as Categories 1 and 2 programs. These programs were noted as the most financially stable programs in place. Although none of these programs would likely be at risk for discontinuation, there remains a need to examine all programs of study in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. The same process described in Phase II will be conducted

for programs in Categories 1 and 2 in Fall 2015. The primary purpose of this review will focus on completing curriculum mapping to ensure that the array of courses offered in each program of study is the smallest number needed to ensure effective learning and increase the marketability of the program in terms of meeting business and industry standards. An expected result will be identification of those programs which re-investment of funding is warranted. The Faculty Governance Committee will be called upon to provide advice and recommendations to the Provost and President during Phase III.

PROGRAM DISCONTINUANCE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

After the University of Louisiana System Board of Supervisors reviews and approves my recommendations, the following plan will be implemented with respect to students.

1. Immediate stop to admitting students to discontinued programs.
2. Charge impacted academic departments with developing teach-out plans and submitting those plans to the Office of Academic Affairs for approval; teach-out plans will include specific options for students who have completed more than 60 degree hours and students who have completed fewer than 60 degree hours.
3. Identify each impacted student, develop structured advising plans, and identify specific advisors to work with students in each discipline associated with a discontinued program; these activities will be jointly stewarded by the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management (this approach will ensure that consistent information is provided to all affected students and that students will be encouraged to enroll in remaining coursework in a timely manner).
4. Charge academic departments with completing necessary paperwork for curriculum changes, to be effective in the next catalog year.
5. Refer students who cannot complete degree requirements within a reasonable timeline to other University of Louisiana System universities with the desired program of study.

The following are actions that will be taken with respect to faculty impacted by program discontinuation and restructuring plans.

1. Ensure compliance with the University of Louisiana System bylaw Chapter III, XV: Faculty and Staff Termination.
2. Work with University of Louisiana System counsel to identify appropriate actions to be taken based on presenting circumstances and develop “if-then” guidelines to address each type of faculty scenario.
3. Ensure adherence to American Association of University Professors (AAUP) policy/practices related to faculty retention and dismissal.

After receiving Board approval, the University of New Orleans will request support from the University of Louisiana System Board of Supervisors to support implementation of the plan.

Summary

In order for the University of New Orleans to more effectively fulfill its mission as a comprehensive urban research university, significant strategic changes must occur soon. The recently completed program review process was arduous, and program discontinuation recommendations are included in this report. Faculty input in this process has been invaluable as they are ultimately responsible for the quality of academic programs. Implementation of the revitalization plan will stabilize the financial standing of the institution and position it for future sustainable growth.

APPENDIX I Faculty Governance Committee Membership

The Faculty Governance Committee includes the following members:

- 1) Members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee
- 2) One additional member from each college and the library as elected by those constituents
- 3) If there are not at least two department chairs in the above membership, one or two will be added to ensure that two department chairs are members; the selection of these chairs will be decided by majority vote of the committee
- 4) Two deans, selected by University administration
- 5) Interdisciplinary Studies (IDS) Academic Director
- 6) Chair of Academic Freedom, Tenure and Professional Ethics Committee (AFTPE) or representative from that committee chosen by that committee
- 7) Additional ad hoc members when needed as chosen by majority vote of the Faculty Governance Committee
- 8) Ex-officio members: President of University; Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Vice President for Research and Economic Development

Members shall serve for three years unless otherwise dictated by their position (e.g., Senate Executive Committee Members, IDS Academic Director, Chair of AFTPE Committee)

APPENDIX II Faculty Governance Committee Timeline

| DATE | COMMITTEE ACTIONS |
|---------------------|--|
| March 2014 | Faculty Governance Committee formed and charged |
| April 2014 | University Faculty Workload Policy developed and approved by the University Administration |
| May 2014 | Faculty Evaluation Policy developed |
| June - October 2014 | Academic Program Review |
| November 2014 | Review Results and Submit Recommendations to the Office of Academic Affairs and President |

APPENDIX III Faculty Governance Committee Report

Faculty Governance Committee Preliminary Report on Program Evaluation

Nov. 11, 2014

Introduction

The University of New Orleans is a unique institution that has tremendous opportunity to be highly successful. Due to a confluence of factors, the university has yet to achieve its potential. Strong leadership, vision, focused efforts, clear communication, and effective use of resources are all required in order to overcome current challenges and to thrive.

The Faculty Governance Committee has responded to its charge and carefully considered all programs at UNO in order to assess each program's potential for supporting the university mission into the future. Throughout the program review process, the committee has worked to overcome two basic challenges. First, there was a compressed time frame to design, accomplish, and evaluate all programs. Second, there is a mismatch between the sort of data needed to do a comprehensive evaluation and the data that can be provided by current UNO administrative systems. The committee has done a thoughtful and thorough job of evaluating programs given our current challenges. Additional work is needed over the next 6-12 months to further evaluate programs as supplementary data are gathered in more usable formats. It is important for the university community to understand that we cannot wait for either perfect data or a perfect evaluation system. We must work with available data in order to institute a concurrent process of continuous improvement into our program evaluation system.

Approach

The Faculty Governance Committee, including the addition of all Deans to the committee, investigated processes used by other universities as well as additional resources. From these resources, the committee selected 6 evaluation criteria and weighted each (see Table 1). Subcommittees then determined the data needed to score each program based on the criteria and developed protocols for assessing these data and assigning scores. Once subcommittee scores were assigned, the full committee reviewed the scores. After soliciting feedback from department chairs and all faculty members, the 6 criteria scores were revised as needed. Appendix 1 provides the assigned criteria scores as well as an overview of the scoring methods. Each committee member considered the program scores, statements from department chairs, inter-program connections, and the university mission in sorting programs into categories. The four categories are: 1) Enhance, 2) Sustain, 3) Restructure, Merge, or Otherwise Transform, and 4) Close. These categories are further explained in Table 2. Committee members first made preliminary votes for program categories. After tabulating these votes, the full committee met to consider the results and make a final vote for Category 3 and 4. Placement into Category 4 (Close) required a 2/3 majority vote of the committee. Members who had a conflict of interest abstained from voting (for example, members could not vote on programs from their own department).

Due to time constraints, the committee has not finalized sorting of programs into Category 1 and Category 2. Additional work will be completed over the next 6-8 weeks in order to differentiate between Category 1 and 2.

The current committee recommendations balance a careful approach with an immediate need for revitalization and restructuring. Hasty closure of programs puts the university at risk for future instability and impaired growth. Consequently, the committee has recommended for closure only programs that were deemed to be unable to survive in the current fiscal and enrollment climates. Programs that we thought needed further investigation (including cost analysis) were placed in Category 3. We recommend that these programs address the findings of the evaluation by the end of the spring 2015 semester. The aim of such review is to stimulate positive change and growth in order to build a stronger university. We have the opportunity with these programs to merge, restructure, or transform them. Throughout the review process, it became obvious to the committee that there are strategic ways to use the limited resources across campus for growth and innovation. However, the faculty and Deans of each college should undertake that process as they know their departments best. For example, the College of Education and Human Development has undertaken a thirteen-month process of evaluating its own programs and is well on the way to its own conclusions. Some academic programs in the College of Liberal Arts have also developed strategies for collaboration, and others are building on previous efforts to systematically use limited resources. However, we fully expect that the outcome of Category 3 program review may result in merging and closure of some of these programs.

Administrative Costs

The Faculty Governance Committee has taken a systematic, open, inclusive, and unbiased approach to evaluating degree programs and recommending a program array for future growth of the university. While this process is essential to the health of any university, it cannot be effectively undertaken without a parallel process in non-instructional administrative departments. Cost containment and minimization of administrative and instructional overhead rates are key strategies to overcoming financial difficulties. While enrollment growth is the best long-term solution to fiscal instability, short-term strategies must include administrative efficiency as the number one priority. Strategic changes in operating procedures must be instituted immediately, and the process must involve broad, meaningful input from faculty constituents. The careful and difficult work undertaken by the Faculty Governance Committee is meaningless without a parallel process for administrative programs.

Limitations

A number of limitations emerged in the process. While we are confident that this represents our best attempt, we note the limitations of this study. The time frame was compressed. Most universities that have embarked on this process, such as the University of Alaska, worked for 18 months to two years. We had barely five months for this process that had never been attempted at the University of New Orleans. Therefore, there was no precedent to follow; we created the process, which in itself is time consuming.

There remain limitations in the data itself. Because of the type of data needed, we were unable to measure cost by program. With additional time for further review we plan to link costs to individual programs. Collecting the data into usable form took more than two months. We expect going forward that we can build databases that will more easily reflect the evaluation needs. Because of the data limitations, some quantitative data was used in three different criteria, leading to some bias against small programs. We worked carefully to address this bias through the use of the more qualitative narratives developed by the chairs of each department. External demand in this time-compressed period was difficult to measure. We hope for programs in Category 3 to explore this issue in more depth.

Table 1. Evaluation Criteria and Their Weighting

| Criterion | Key Components | Weight |
|-------------------------------------|---|--------|
| External Demand for Programs | Short term and long term demand (new students); workforce demand | 15% |
| Internal Demand | General education and support of other programs, feeder to masters programs, number of majors | 15% |
| Size, Scope, and Productivity | Retention, SCHs, Completers, research | 20% |
| Quality of Inputs and Outputs | Number of full time, tenure track faculty; Quality of student outputs | 10% |
| Revenue | Tuition, state allocations, indirect from grants, donation | 15% |
| Impact, Justification, Essentiality | Alumni, industry, mission alignment | 25% |

Table 2. Program Categories

| Category | Description |
|---|--|
| 1) Enhance | Programs with the highest potential for positively impacting the university mission; should receive enhanced resources to support growth in student learning outcomes, scholarly productivity, and revenue (current resources are deemed insufficient) |
| 2) Sustain | Programs with clear potential for positively impacting the university mission; should receive sufficient resources to support growth in student learning outcomes, scholarly productivity, and revenue (current resources are deemed insufficient) |
| 3) Restructure, Merge, or Otherwise Transform | Programs have potential for growth and making an important impact on the university mission; scarcity of resource, changing demand, program stagnation, or other limitations threaten program viability; new models or approaches are needed to build stronger programs that can flourish; some programs may later be deemed non-viable, but the majority are expected to emerge with strength; Colleges must devise transformation plans by the end of the spring 2015 semester |
| 4) Close | Due to the current fiscal and enrollment climate, these programs can no longer be maintained and should be closed |

Recommendations

The expanded Faculty Governance Committee puts forth the following recommendations to President Fos. The committee *strongly* urges the President to consider these recommendations carefully. Wide faculty participation was involved in completing this work, and development of continued shared governance and faculty-administrative collaboration can only be achieved if faculty driven leadership is respected and valued by the administration. Premature closure of programs placed in Category 3 would have a negative impact on the future of the university.

Category 1 and 2: Enhance or Sustain. Programs in these two categories are currently combined since the committee did not have sufficient time to differentiate these two categories. The committee will continue with this endeavor with a goal of refining these categories by January 2015.

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| B.A. English | M.P.A. Public Administration |
| B.A. Film & Theatre | M.S. Accounting |
| B.A. Fine Arts | M.S. Biological Sciences |
| B.A. History | M.S. Chemistry |
| B.A. Music | M.S. Computer Science |
| B.I.S. Interdisciplinary Studies | M.S. Earth & Environ Sciences |
| B.S. Accounting | M.S. Engineering |
| B.S. Biological Sciences | M.S. Financial Economics |
| B.S. Business Administration | M.S. Health Care Management |
| B.S. Chemistry | M.S. Hospitality & Tourism |
| B.S. Civil Engineering | M.S. Math |
| B.S. Computer Science | M.S. Psychology |
| B.S. Earth & Environ Sciences | M.S. Tax Accounting |
| B.S. Electrical Engineering | M.U.R.P. Urban & Regional Planning |
| B.S. Finance | Ph.D. Chemistry |
| B.S. Hotel, Restaurant, & Tourism | Ph.D. Counselor Education |
| B.S. Human Performance & Health Promotion | Ph.D. Engineering & Applied Science |
| B.S. Management | Ph.D. Financial Economics |
| B.S. Marketing | Ph.D. Integrative Biology |
| B.S. Math | Ph.D. Psychology |
| B.S. Mechanical Engineering | Ph.D. Urban Studies |
| B.S. Naval Architecture & Marine Engineering | |
| B.S. Psychology | |
| B.A. Sociology | |
| M.A. English | |
| M.A.T. C&I | |
| M.B.A. Business Administration | |
| M.Ed. Counselor Education | |
| M.F.A. Creative Writing | |
| M.F.A. Film & Theatre | |
| M.M. Music | |

Category 3: Restructure, Merge, or Otherwise Transform. Declining state allocations to public higher education institutions, declining enrollment, and changes in workforce needs have all contributed to difficulties for many programs at UNO. While external pressures have played a large role in creating challenges for all programs, the reality of higher education requires new vision to build stronger, more viable programs. In order to remain competitive, programs in this category must create new operating models. Such models may include merged programs, focus on high demand sub-disciplines, cross-discipline endeavors, development of certificate or other high demand markets, and in some cases discontinuance of programs. Because program characteristics are best understood by those in the field, strategies for program transformation must come from the programs themselves in collaboration with college leadership. Each program in this category is required to prepare a Restructuring Plan and submit the plan to the Faculty Governance Committee by the end of the spring 2015 semester. Plans should be innovative, student centered, and focused on strengthening the university. The committee will be providing guidance to each program to help in preparing plans. A majority vote was required to place a program in Category 3.

B.A. Anthropology

B.A. International Studies

B.A. Philosophy

B.A. Political Science

B.A. Romance Languages

B.S. Elementary Education

B.S. Physics

B.S. Secondary Teaching

B.S. Urban Studies

M.A. Arts Administration

M.A. History

M.A. Political Science

M.A. Romance Languages

M.A. Sociology

M.A.T. Special Education

M.Ed. Curriculum & Instruction

M.Ed. Educational Leadership

M.Ed. Special Education

M.F.A. Fine Arts

M.S. Applied Physics

M.S. Engineering Management

M.S. Urban Studies

Ph.D. Curriculum & Instruction

Ph.D. Educational Administration

Ph.D. Special Education

Category 4: Program Closure. The programs in this category are recommended for closure. This recommendation is based on enrollment patterns, expected future demand for the program, and anticipated trends in future workforce needs. Only programs that were deemed unable to remain viable were placed into this category. It is important to note that a number of factors contributed to the demise of these programs. Placement into this category does not reflect in any way on the quality of students and teaching in these programs.

B.S. Early Childhood Education

B.S. Elem Ed & Mild Mod Disabilities

Ph.D. Political Science

Voting Members of Faculty Governance Committee:Chair

Matthew Tarr

Members

Pat Austin

Edit Bourgeois

Elaine Brooks

Nancy Easterlin

Renia Ehrenfeucht

Cheryl Hayes

Pamela Jenkins (Faculty Senate President and co-Facilitator of Program Evaluation)

Darrell Kruger

Enrique LaMotta

Jim Logan

Marie Morgan

Jeanne Pavy

Dinah Payne

Connie Phelps

Jairo Santanilla

Wendy Schluchter

Peter Schock

Greg Seab

Tumulesh Solanky

Richard Speaker

Cherie Trumbach

Guest Members with Voting Privileges for Revitalization Process

Kevin Graves

Steven Johnson

Sharon Mader

Norman Whitley

John Williams

APPENDIX IV Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs Report



THE UNIVERSITY *of*
NEW ORLEANS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Date: November 10, 2014

To: Faculty Governance Committee

From: Richard S. Hansen
Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: Program closure and reorganization

I am writing to indicate that I will be making a recommendation to the President concerning program closure and reorganization. As Chief Academic Officer and having been a part of the program assessment process with you, I thought it appropriate to offer President Fos my recommendation. I viewed the same data that the voting members utilized in making decisions and feel that the data calls for more than three (3) programs to be discontinued. The following chart details my thinking about how certain programs could be reorganized or combined and my rationale for making certain recommendations.

I think that recommendations about reorganization are appropriate given the committee's placing twenty five (25) programs into this category. President Fos will have both recommendations for his consideration. As you will see, I have recommended certain programs be closed with Board action in December 2014 at the same time providing ample time for reorganization or restructuring consistent with your recommendations.

As this phase of our work draws to a conclusion, please accept my sincere thanks and respect for your hundreds of hours of work analyzing, struggling over the data, and considering what configuration of UNO academic programs will provide a basis for the institution to move forward on a more solid footing. You have all performed a great service to UNO and have demonstrated the best of shared governance. It has been a pleasure working with you to make UNO stronger and more academically focused.

**Table 1: Academic Program Discontinuation and Revitalization - Phase 1
Recommendations Submitted by:
Interim Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs
November 10, 2014**

| <i>College of Education and Human Development</i> | | |
|---|--|---|
| <i>Degree Program</i> | <i>Recommended Action</i> | <i>Rationale</i> |
| B.S. Early Childhood Education (Grades PreKindergarten – 3) | Discontinue program | Low enrollment; Change in add on certification regulations does not require university coursework |
| B.S. Elementary Education – Integrated/Merged Approach | Discontinue program | Low enrollment and low completer numbers over 3 year period |
| M.Ed. Special Education | Discontinue programs and create a single M.Ed. in Teaching and Learning in collaboration with existing M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction with concentrations informed by school district personnel | Low enrollment and low completer numbers over 3 year period |
| Ph.D. Curriculum and Instruction | Discontinue programs and create a single Ph.D. in Teaching and Learning | Low enrollment and low completer numbers over 3 year period |
| Ph.D. Special Education | | |
| <i>College of Liberal Arts</i> | | |
| <i>Degree Program</i> | <i>Recommended Action</i> | <i>Rationale</i> |
| B.A. Geography | Already Discontinued – Retain Minor | Program discontinued in May 2011; Teach out plan completed |
| M.A. Geography | Already Discontinued – Offer service coursework for other graduate programs if needed | Program discontinued in December 2009; Teach out plan completed |
| M.A. Political Science | Discontinue program and possibly create a concentration within a new M.A. in Social Sciences | Low enrollment and low completer numbers for 3 year period |
| M.A. Romance Languages | Discontinue program | Low enrollment |
| Ph.D. Political Science | Discontinue program | Low enrollment |