

THE UMKC FACULTY SENATE

REPORT

October 8, 2003, Room 104 Cockefair Hall, 10:00-11:00 a.m.

Reporter: Jakob H. Waterborg, Senator, IFC representative.

Topic of discussion: **The Program Viability Audit process at UMKC.** For 2003/2004, Political Science, Sociology, Physics and ULAPSE were identified as programs subject to the viability audit.

Academic Vice-President Steve Lehmkuhle reviewed UM System reasoning and actions.

- The Reduction of Academic Costs (RedAC) report ([http://system.missouri.edu/vpacad/planning/cost_reduction/RedAC Task Force Report.pdf](http://system.missouri.edu/vpacad/planning/cost_reduction/RedAC%20Task%20Force%20Report.pdf)) identified that terminating academic programs is not an effective way to reduce cost, that termination of programs at a time of increasing enrollments is counterproductive, that salary costs including compensation may represent as much as 80% of our budget, and that costs per program vary widely (one third of programs cover their cost of instruction and two thirds don't).
- Program Review is currently done through COPE with a focus on strategic planning and improvement of the unit and a tendency to be highly protective of the existing program. The Program Viability Audit (PVA) has a distinct intention: to do an academic checkup based on financial, enrollment and graduation parameters (see below). [Collected Rules and Regulations 20.035 on Program Assessment can be found at <http://www.system.missouri.edu/uminfo/rules/administration/20035.htm>]
- Faculty Workload and Instructional Workload [Collected Rules and Regulations 310.090] expectations have recently been clarified.

What was the role of the System in identifying programs to review?

- The System did an analysis of 'vital signs' of 145 academic units and programs, based on data available to the System, in the knowledge that local campus and departmental information would be more accurate and would correct and modify initial identification of programs. Factors considered included (based on 2000 data [i.e. 2000/2001 FY01 data]; more current data from PeopleSoft systems are not (yet) accessible): cost subsidy, relative to national benchmarks; instructional productivity; research productivity; 5 year trend of enrollment and credit hour production; extent of service teaching; degree program profile; number of majors; number of graduates.
- The initial list of identified programs was discussed with the Chief Academic Officers on each campus [i.e. Provost S. Ballard for UMKC]. On-campus review of programs was expected, including correction of data and assessment of program importance for the campus mission. Chancellors could add or remove programs from the initial list. Chancellors are expected to report to the System on outcomes and actions taken for programs selected for PVA but have not been instructed what actions can or should be taken. A System expectation of the PVA process was presented but no campus process was prescribed.
- The initial screen identified 48 programs across the System, fairly evenly distributed, from which UMKC made its choice of programs to review in 2003/2004. The System will repeat its analysis annually and present its data to the campuses. The System realizes that publicity may

have negative effects as it may focus on units and programs that may be discontinued, but it also expects that its identification will act as a wake-up call that may rescue through action important programs that otherwise might be lost. The RedAC report emphasizes that we should maximize our resources. If we cannot manage our degree program inventory through growth, as we have done historically, we must find new ways to renew our program options in a time when expansion does not appear likely in the next 5 years. Not to start new programs and initiatives may damage the university irreparably.

UMKC Provost Steve Ballard reviewed campus reasoning and actions.

- We must manage our resources. In December 2002 the Deans accepted 6 criteria for assessment of programs of units. Deans and Cabinet have decided that any cuts will be based on these criteria and that no more across-the-board cuts will be made. UMKC has decentralized its resources to the (academic) unit level with unit accountability and net-revenue sharing. UMKC will focus its resources on the 5 University goals and 14 measures to those goals.
- The Resources for the Vision committee represents a year-long process of review for academic units and identify them as belonging in 4 categories (see below). This does not mean that a rank ordering of all programs will be done. Part of the responsibility of this committee is the PVA process of the 4 units identified by UMKC for program audit in 2003/2004.

[Information can be found on the UMKC web at: <http://www.umkc.edu/provost/resources/>]

- Is the PVA driven by the budget? No. With declining state support, it is important that our resource allocation process is sound even if we have to deal with the budget realities and a pessimistic outlook on future budgets. We must not create a self-fulfilling prophecy.
- We want to review and categorize (and not 'rank-order') programs. Some examples. The Conservatory has now 19 programs, 5 of which with less than 4 students; a critical assessment has started in the Conservatory how to change this. 750 UMKC courses listed have not been taught in the last 3.5 years; Steve LaNasa has been asked to guide a process of cleaning-up. The School of Computing and Engineering has adopted an action plan with internal reorganization to concentrate and maximize available resources.
- The System initially identified 14 programs at UMKC. Over a 4-month process, the provost talked with all deans and, for instance, Dean LeBeau (A&S) talked to his chairs. It was the provost who in late July 2003 made the choice of the 4 programs to be audited. He initiated the current process and constituted the Resources for the Vision committee.

Frank Horton, appointed chair of the 2003/2004 Resources for the Vision committee, reviewed committee deliberations and actions.

- What is the Viability Audit? On October 7, 2003, the committee guidelines were approved. [It is available at <http://www.umkc.edu/provost/resources/Program Viability Audit Outline.doc>] The committee has contacted the four identified units. Initial action has been focused on data issues, which were a priori judged as "It is all wrong." It is clear that the academic units must review the data used and it is clear that we must prevent that wrong data are entered into the UM System. The committee has compiled for its members all letters, exchanges and UM System data that have been part of the process to-date.
- What is the difference between the COPE (Council On Program Evaluation) evaluation process and the PVA (Program Viability Audit) evaluation process? The committee will recommend changes in the COPE report to reflect viability issues. As part of the PVA, the committee will place academic programs into four categories: (1) Priority programs that are central to UMKC's

goals; (2) Sound programs; (3) Programs with problems (which may include 'priority programs'); (4) Viability assessment.

- The PVA will recommend a database that will identify issues and trends as soon as possible.
- The PVA will also review the productivity of individual degree programs.
- Viability Audit reports for the four identified units are expected on or prior to March 2004.

Questions raised by faculty.

Question: [J. Dean, English, A&S] *In which way was the initial list of 14 programs reduced to the 4 programs selected for audit?*

[S. Ballard] This process went in direct consultation with the deans and deans were informed of all issues identified. For instance, Dean LeBeau and I decided to address the Math department issues through a separate process.

[S. Lehmkuhle] We are often asked to follow a more business model in addressing budget reductions. In business one cuts back production of product that is not in demand. But our product is in high demand. Cutting back our education production does not make sense.

Question: [G. Ebersole, Interdisciplinary Studies, A&S] *In view of cut backs in academic programs: have analyses been done of administrative costs and administrative efficiency?*

[S. Lehmkuhle] We have been doing that, e.g. consider our approach to consolidation of UM System and UMC administrative positions. In this time of budget problems, we must either do things differently, i.e. increase quality, or we must decrease cost, i.e. increase efficiency. The latter we have already been doing, e.g. in IT (Information Systems) where the UM and UMC organizations have been merged and reduced in size.

[S. Ballard] Last year, Jennifer Spielvogel has presented data to the Senate on administrative positions at UMKC. \$300,000 was cut from the Provost's office. We have to realize that UMKC for its size of campus has a very large number of academic units (11) and deans (13). Also, there are issues of productivity across campus.

Question: [W. Lucas, Sociology, A&S] *The COPE review is a better, more careful process. Is the Viability Audit just an accounting audit?*

[S. Lehmkuhle] The initial System screen was an accounting procedure. However, the substantive issues are the responsibility of the campus.

[F. Horton] The outline of the viability study will shortly be posted on the web. [It is available from <http://www.umkc.edu/provost/resources/>] The COPE data could be used as part of the viability issue, incorporating quantitative and qualitative aspects.

Question: [J. Waterborg, SBS] *How were members on the Resources for the Vision committee chosen? For many who are part of units subject to the audit a conflict of interest exists.*

[S. Ballard] The PVA task is not a major focus of the committee. I wanted a majority of faculty on the committee. Members should recuse themselves if conflict of interest issues arise. I looked for members with experience in the type of processes required like dean Osborne. I also looked for academic, demographic and program diversity but I know I could not always get what I wanted.

Question: [F. Lee, Economics, A&S] *I'm part of the committee for UMKC Goal 2, which aims to develop criteria to identify ten top-10 academic programs. (There are lots of openings for additional participation.) I see a large overlap with the tasks of the Resources for the Vision committee that has responsibility for the PVA process. Could liaisons link these related activities?*

Question: [E. Gogol, SBS] *I see the administration driving and steering the various processes. Faculty were not asked for our opinion. In fact, the Senate was not even asked to select its own representative. [Senator Jim Durig was appointed by the provost as Senate representative.]*

Question: [J. Sturgeon, Economics, A&S] *Data veracity appears to be a problem. What support will be given to departments so that we can get and verify the data used?*

[F. Horton to J. Spielvogel] How can we get and identify, verify the data?

[J. Spielvogel] All Fiscal Year 01 data [i.e. for the 2000/2001 academic year] will be distributed. You/we should ask for resources to check the data! We have no data for FY02 and FY03 because the transition to PeopleSoft creates problems producing consistent analyzed data at this time.

[F. Horton] Departments should respond to queries with data they believe to be accurate and that can be verified.

[S. Ballard] Steve LeNasa and Jennifer Spielvogel will assist with data.

[S. Lehmkuhle] The UM System does not have the data. You have [better] data. Hopefully by the end of this academic year the datawarehouse will be a reality. Then you as department chairs will have direct access to the same data that the UM System has.

[The following information is based on notes by J. Spielvogel with some additional commentary:] Also, a data analysis Reporting Task Force with Bob Mullen, has begun to design data reporting designs from the PeopleSoft data and is scheduled to begin providing PeopleSoft-based data reports [presumably starting with 2001/2002 FY02 data] by June 2004. Bob Mullen is visiting the 4 campuses to get feedback on the draft designs for data reports. This will be an on-going task through 2003-04.

Respectfully submitted,
Jakob Waterborg