This memorandum outlines the UPC Data Analysis Subgroup’s plan for assessing academic programs for realignment, investment, and disinvestment.

**Initial Considerations**

First, we understand that a critical part of our task is to identify at least $5M in annual savings from the Academic Affairs budget. Consequently, we need to focus on programs with significant budget impact. To do that, we will concentrate on degree-granting programs at the 2-year, undergraduate major, graduate, and professional levels, excluding minors, certificates, and the like.¹

Second, we believe it is essential that we build upon the work of APASP rather than starting a new process from scratch. After reviewing the APASP process and discussing its strengths and limitations, we decided not to rely on the final scores and recommendations from the APASP Task Force. We will consider the reviewers’ scores on the APASP criteria for Quality, Demand, Alignment, and Opportunity in our Second Stage analysis described below.

We recognize that much of the data underlying the APASP process contained errors, omissions, and anomalies. For the quantitative part of our analysis, we are relying only on the most reliable central data available. We are working with the central data office and potentially affected units to ensure that the data is as reliable and valid as possible. We recognize that the data will never be perfect; in the final analysis we will need to rely on the best available data.

Third, whereas the APASP process consciously did not take budgetary implications into account, we understand that our charge requires us to be explicit about the financial impact of decisions to realign, invest, and disinvest in academic programs. We will include cost data in our analysis as a new factor to be considered.

Finally, we understand the importance of keeping the campus as a whole informed throughout this process and of providing for meaningful review and recommendation by shared governance. We continue to engage with shared governance on how best to do that.

**Stage One Analysis: Productivity & Efficiency**

The first stage of our analysis will assess programs for productivity and efficiency using the best available data. Our goal is to identify a pool of programs with comparatively high cost and low enrollment, with that pool subject to further analysis in stage two. We will refer to programs in that pool as Programs for Further Consideration.

¹ Note that this approach also excludes the Mansfield Library, a unit of Academic Affairs. The UPC continues to work with Library personnel to formulate a process for assessing the Library.
For this stage, we will rank programs on two measures: number of students served (including majors, degrees, and SCH), and cost per student credit hour. For these purposes, we will rank programs with other programs of the same degree type (2YR, Undergrad Major, or Grad/Professional). The two measures are:

1) **Productivity.** We need to know how many students a program is serving to understand its importance to UM. Because there are different ways of measuring the students served, we will combine three measures:
   - 5Y AVG number of majors (2Y, UG) or number of students (G, Professional)
   - 5Y AVG degrees awarded (2Y, UG, G, Professional)
   - 5Y AVG student credit hours (2Y, UG, G, Professional)

   For each metric, we will rank all programs within degree types. So, for example, we have 58 undergrad majors. The program with the highest SCH would receive 58 points on that metric, while the program with the lowest SCH would receive 1 point. We will sum the scores on the three metrics to give each program an overall score. Because majors and degrees measure similar factors, we will weight total SCH as 50% of the overall score and majors and degrees as 25% each. (We will also run tables on each metric separately to look for programs that stand out in one measure but not another.)

2) **Efficiency.** We will use Cost per Student Credit Hour as a measure of efficiency. We will take into account relevant Delaware data on the cost of instruction to add context to the analysis, recognizing that certain types of programs are inherently more expensive than others.

We anticipate at the end of Stage One to generate tables of programs for each of the three main degree types (2YR, Undergrad Major, Graduate), along the following lines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>STUDENTS SERVED</th>
<th>COST/SCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We will work with Administration & Finance and the Provost’s Office to estimate the likely budget impact of curtailing or discontinuing the Programs for Further Consideration to ensure we can capture at least $5M in savings.

**Stage Two Analysis: Quality, Demand, Alignment and Opportunity**

In stage two, we will conduct an analysis of all Programs for Further Consideration in order to illuminate the context and countervailing factors that will guide decisions to invest in particular programs despite low enrollment and/or high cost.

As an initial matter, we note the importance of considering research productivity. A program with comparatively small enrollment may generate significant research dollars for the University. We will

---

2 A matter for the larger UPC to consider is the ultimate use of grant funds. In the same way the UPC seeks to align general fund revenue with our new mission and areas of excellence, we need to make sure that expenditures of grant funds align with the mission and areas of excellence.

---
use the data in APASP Criteria 5, Metrics 5 & 7 to estimate the research dollars generated by the Programs for Further Consideration. Those metrics are:

- 5YA of expenditures on external grants and contracts per T/TT & Research faculty FTE (2Y, UG, G, Professional)
- 5YA of IDC generated per T/TT & Research faculty FTE (2Y, UG, G, Professional)

We also believe enrollment trends should be a factor guiding ultimate decisions. A program that has seen significant growth in recent years, even if overall enrollment is small, may be worth further investment.

We emphasize in the strongest terms that quantitative metrics tell at best a part of the story of our University. We need to know the quality of our programs and how they fit with the needs of students and the mission of the University to make good choices about our future. We concluded that it would be infeasible in the time allowed to conduct new qualitative analyses of potentially affected units. Instead, we plan to rely on the APASP reviewers’ scores on APASP Criteria 1, 2, 4, and 6, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
<th>DEMAND</th>
<th>ALIGNMENT</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quintile rankings on APASP Criterion 4 Reviewers’ Scores</td>
<td>Quintile rankings on APASP Criterion 2 Reviewers’ Scores</td>
<td>Quintile rankings on APASP Criterion 1 Reviewers’ Scores</td>
<td>Quintile rankings on APASP Criterion 6 Reviewers’ Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We acknowledge that the APASP reviewers’ scores suffered from problems of intercoder reliability, as evidenced by the large spread in standard deviations. We will flag programs with particularly large standard deviations and collect additional information regarding those programs, including authors’ and deans’ responses to the task force’s recommendations.

We also recognize that the APASP Alignment and Opportunity criteria were tied to the UM 2020 Strategic Plan and the more recent UM Strategic Vision, respectively. The UPC’s Mission & Identity subgroup is currently working on a new mission statement, as well as new areas of excellence and core values. Because many elements in both the UM 2020 plan and the Strategic Vision reflect fundamental characteristics of the University, we believe it is appropriate to consider those criteria at this stage of the analysis. We expect the new mission, areas of excellence, and core values to inform the programmatic decisions to be made in the recommendation stage.

**Recommendations for Curtailment, Discontinuance, or Reorganization**

At the conclusion of Stage Two, the UPC will provide the President with its analysis of all Programs for Further Consideration. The President may then consult with the Provost, Academic Deans, or others in generating a set of recommendations for curtailment, discontinuance, or reorganization of academic programs. As stated, we understand that the President and deans will draw on the work of the Mission &
Identity subgroup to make strategic decisions about which programs align with the University’s new mission, areas of excellence, and core values.

The President will deliver a set of preliminary recommendations to shared governance so that those groups have the opportunity to review and recommend any changes to his recommendations. The President will consider the recommendations from shared governance and then convey his final recommendations to the Board of Regents at its May meeting.

Over the summer, the President will continue to work with the Provost, Deans, UPC, and others to create action plans to implement the recommendations. To the extent retrenchment is necessary because action requires the termination of tenured faculty, the President will initiate the process for retrenchment as specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

**Proposed Timeline**

April 17: Presentation of preliminary list of programs for curtailment, discontinuance, or reorganization presented to Faculty Senate

April 17-May 4: Shared governance reviews preliminary list and makes recommendations

May 18: President makes final recommendations