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PROGRAM PRIORITIZATION
for Administrative and Service Units
The Need for Reform

- **Internal and external pressures**
  - Increase revenues
  - Decrease expenses
  - Improve quality
  - Strengthen reputation

- **Rapidly changing higher education landscape**
  - Decreased state funding
  - Competing forces (online, non-profits, MOOCs, …)

- **UMD challenge**
  - Lack of sustainable suite of programs for current recurring budget
  - Program numbers and credit requirements increasing each year

*We must align with our mission and vision in a way that we have a sustainable future with quality programs and services.*
Dickeson Model

Outlines the process that has been effective for many institutions facing these challenges.

Focus on academic programs, but the model has also been used for a range of other programs.
Drake adapted Dickeson’s model for administrative programs.

Described in NACUBO article
http://www.nacubo.org/Business_Officer_Magazine/Magazine_Archives/April_2007/Keeping_Programs_and_Resources_in_Sync.html
Leadership

- Chancellor
  - Working with Vice Chancellors and Deans to determine final outcomes

- VC Units
  - Academic Programs and Services: EVCAA, Deans, Directors
  - Student Life Programs and Services: VCSL and Directors
  - Finance and Operations Programs and Services: VCFO and Directors
  - Athletics, Alumni, Development, External Affairs and programs housed in the Chancellor’s Office: Chancellor and Directors

- Academic Programs
  - Deans, Department Heads, Faculty
  - Data provided by EVCAA (Institutional Research) for applicable categories
Ground Rules

1. All programs are included
2. Union contracts will be followed for positions affected
3. All positions may be considered in potential changes
4. All students currently in academic programs will be accommodated (program switch, program wind-down plan, etc.)
5. Units will focus internally on their own programs rather than engage in efforts to suggest cuts in other departments, units and divisions
Phase 1: Collection & Evaluation

Develop Criteria, Categories, and Weights
Develop Rubrics and Templates
Compile Data
Scoring
Recommendations

APPC: Administrative/Services Program Prioritization Committee
DD: Divisional Directors

- Programs, APPC, DD
- APPC, DD
- Programs, VC units, Chan
- APPC, DD
- Cabinet
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Phase 2: Implementation
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2014

Transition Plans Developed for each Program

Budget Planning

HR Planning

Transition
Suggested Criteria

1. Importance to UMD
2. External/internal demand
3. Quality
4. Cost-effectiveness
5. Opportunity analysis
#1: Importance to UMD

Questions
• What is the purpose of the program? Why does it exist?
• How has the purpose changed in recent years?
• How do you expect the purpose to change in the near future?
• What are the most important goals of the program?
• List the key functions of the program.

Sample scored categories
• Program maturity
• Adaptability
• Congruence with institutional expectations, mission
#2: External/Internal Demand

- **Questions**
  - Who are the key users of the program?
  - How do you measure the user demand for the program?
  - How has the user demand for the program changed in recent years?
  - How is the user demand for the program likely to change in the near future? Why?
  - List other departments on campus with which your program has the most continual interaction and explain briefly the nature of those interactions.
  - List other departments on campus that are providing a service or function similar to the one provided by your program.

- **Sample scored categories**
  - Usage data (5 years)
  - Number of campus partners
#3: Quality

- Questions
  - What benchmarks do you use to measure your program’s quality?
  - How does your program compare to those benchmarks?
  - How is the quality measured and by whom?
  - What were the accomplishments of the program in the past two years?

- Sample scored categories
  - Number, quality and appropriateness of benchmarks
  - UMD comparisons to benchmarked data
  - Maturity of quality measures
#4: Cost Effectiveness

Questions

- What benchmarks do you use to measure your program’s cost-effectiveness? How does your program compare with those benchmarks?
- List the attempts made by the program within the last three years to cut costs and/or operate more efficiently?
- Attach an organizational chart that identifies every employee of the program and includes a list of the top three or four functions carried out by each employee.
- List ways your staff is cross-trained.
- Which skill sets and resources does your program possess that can be shared with other units?
- Identify the revenues or other resources generated by the program.
- Break down all direct costs associated with the program. (NOTE: we would provide a common format)

Sample scored categories

- Comparison of revenue and expenses
- Effectiveness of cost cutting efforts
#5: Opportunity Analysis

Questions

- What functions within the program could be automated, performed elsewhere in the university, performed by an outside contractor for less money, consolidated or eliminated?
- What additional revenue generation is possible by the program?
- What technologies or training opportunities are available to you to provide your services better?
- What additional cost-saving opportunities can you recommend for your program?
- What are your peers at other institutions doing that UMD should be doing (and isn’t)?
- What would it take to make the program exemplary? (Explain and provide a cost estimation)
- If you could start fresh and totally restructure the program (and/or your department), how would you do it?

Sample scored categories

- Technology utilization

Many articles and books out that can be thought provoking on this topic:
Rating Systems

- Quantitative and Qualitative Measures are desired
  - Score based on rubric (1-5)
  - Numbers from database(s) that can be converted to 1-5 scoring

- Weights
  - Designed for each of the five criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DECISION MATRIX - Administrative and Service Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AREA (Chan, EVCAA, VCSL, VCPO)</td>
<td>Importance to UMD</td>
<td>External/Internal Demand</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Cost-Effectiveness</td>
<td>Opportunity Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Example Program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decision Matrix
Immediate Next Steps

- List of programs
  - Send draft list to your Cabinet team member by June 21, 2013
  - Cabinet leaders will compile the programs for their area

- Formulate APCC
  - Cabinet leaders will nominate two from their area to participate (8 members total)

- Criteria and weights
  - Schokker, Kragness, Seymour and Erwin will develop draft matrix and work with the APCC to finalize

- Website
  - EVCAA will look at options (campus labs, moodle, other)