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**I. History of Project**

**Charter** – The Academic Planning Framework project was launched by Provost Laura Huenneke in late spring 2013, in order to establish shared expectations about the approach to planning changes in academic programs on the Flagstaff campus. While Northern Arizona University has successfully navigated program and curricular streamlining in response to state budget cuts, and has seen the expansion of some programs in response to continued enrollment growth, we now have the opportunity to think more strategically and plan in a more intentional way for future change. Moreover, the process of initiating new programs, or making changes in existing programs, will be less contentious and more successful if there is a shared understanding among administration, faculty, and other stakeholders of the primary bases on which such decisions are made.

The original charter for the Framework project was finalized in early autumn 2013 (see Appendix 1). The charter lays out the broad goals of the project, and its organization into four working groups that each were to tackle a key component of academic planning. The four topics were:

- methods of identifying current areas of strength and competitive advantage;

- methods for measuring the quality and effectiveness of academic programs;

- approaches for identifying and analyzing potential new areas of opportunity;

- and approaches for analyzing and planning program resource needs.

The charter included key questions to lead the discussions of each of the working groups. Those questions had been refined after several discussions of the proposed process in the Provost’s Academic Leadership Council (PALC) and after an open house for PALC, academic chairs, and other interested parties in late August 2013.

**Working groups and campus input** - Working groups were established early in the fall 2013 semester; each group was led by a member of PALC, and comprised volunteers from PALC, from the Academic Chairs Council, and from the Faculty Senate. Groups met through September and October to draft initial versions of proposed approaches as the basis for further exploration by the campus community. Notes from working group meetings and drafts of their initial versions were posted on a SharePoint site established by the Provost’s Office.

Campus input was initiated in the Open House held August 28, 2013, in which faculty and staff gave written responses to a set of prompts about academic planning and the factors influencing our decisions about academic programs. After Working Groups had met several times to draft initial approaches to their topics, a campus forum was held on November 18, 2013; 35 members of the NAU community, plus Ann Duffield (facilitator for Provost Huenneke), attended and heard presentations from each of the working groups. Feedback from that session was used by the working groups to further refine their drafts, and a second Campus Forum was held on December 10, 2013, attended by 27 faculty and staff. Notes from that discussion were consulted as the drafts from the working groups were integrated into a single draft document in January and February 2014.

**Process for review and modifications of integrated draft** – The integrated draft was completed in February 2014 and posted on the Provost’s website for initial campus review. The draft was presented to the following bodies for formal reaction and feedback: PALC, Faculty Senate, ACC.

**Vision for eventual adoption, dissemination, and use** – We anticipate that this framework document will reside on the Provost’s website for frequent consultation and use by the university community. Attention will be paid to updating lists of (and links to) resources that might assist with various component activities. The framework is meant to complement, but not to replace or supplant, official policy with respect to mandated processes of Academic Program Review, accreditation reviews, curricular proposals, or staffing requests. Components of this framework should be highly relevant, however, and should be considered for incorporation into any of these activities or in broader strategic planning by a department, college, or other academic unit.

**II. Vision and Purpose**

The development of this plan during the 2013-14 academic year was rooted within a vision of Northern Arizona University as an academic community, working together on behalf of our students and our region to design, offer, and continuously improve high-quality academic programs.

*An academic community working together* – This plan describes how faculty, staff, and administrators come together and collaborate in the planning, implementation, assessment, and updating of academic programs. We outline the information from other constituencies (students, regional employers, citizens of the region, community partners) that we draw upon, and how it is used in our considerations. We confirm that we do not make decisions in isolation, but consider the real contexts of state, region, student interests and finances, and university operations.

*Designing programs* – This framework lays out the principle considerations that we agree to incorporate in making decisions about the initiation and design of new programs. We acknowledge the diversity of sources from which ideas can be derived. We outline the major institutional and contextual values against which we will evaluate new ideas. We suggest resources that can be used in gathering and analyzing appropriate background information.

*Implementing programs* – Too frequently we deceive ourselves about the true cost of launching or maintaining a program. Important elements of necessary resource investments are ignored, or poorly estimated; even apart from financial resources, we tend to underestimate the opportunity cost of energy invested in one program vs. another. This framework attempts to ensure that everyone has a realistic idea of the resource needs of a new program or a proposed expansion. It should also provide an approach to assessing the sufficiency of resources dedicated to current programs. We anticipate that this framework can encourage a more effective use of all-funds budgeting and appropriate provision of resources from the state, the students, the private sector, or other potential sources.

*Assessment and continuous improvement or updating* – Sometimes we are complacent about the effectiveness of our current programs, and we neglect the opportunity to determine whether redeployment of effort and resources might permit us to launch something of greater value. This framework should provide valuable approaches to strengthening our routine Academic Program Review and external accreditation reviews, helping us take advantage of these opportunities to identify and make improvements. Furthermore, these approaches can assist individual units in deciding the relative value of strategic reallocation of efforts or resources.

**III. Overview of Proposed Component Processes**

When evaluating proposals for new programs, it is helpful to pay formal attention to several discrete considerations – from the political or administrative perspective of process and authority, to the pragmatic evaluation of resource needs, to the qualitative aspects of relationship to mission. A similar formal approach to considering multiple perspectives is necessary in assessing our current portfolio of programs. This framework aims at ensuring systematic and thoughtful attention to each of these perspectives, by laying out proposed approaches to each of several distinct components of evaluation.

A. Initiation of idea or concept, initial review

B. Identification of and response to opportunities for new market niches

C. Identification of areas of current strength and competitive advantage, as useful foundations for a new program or for expansion

D. Measuring and documenting the quality and effectiveness of a program?

E. Projecting and planning the resource needs for a new program or expansion, and reviewing the resource needs for an existing program

F. How units (as well as the Provost’s Office) will use this framework over next few years

**IV. Detailed Steps in Proposed Processes**

**A. Initiation of idea or concept, initial review**

We acknowledge that proposals for a new academic program may originate from any of a wide range of sources, from grass-roots faculty or external discussions to the most “top-down” suggestions from administration, Board of Regents, or state governmental entities. Regardless of the source, each idea must be vetted in a fair and systematic way to promote good decision-making and planning. We lay out here a process by which ideas might move efficiently through a review process that gives the university the ability to make well-informed decisions while remaining nimble and responsive to opportunities or to changing conditions.

**1. Recognize that ideas may be suggested by (or come from) many different sources**

- an existing group of faculty or area of strength, where faculty and leaders identify a related new opportunity

- observation (by faculty, administrators, or others) of interdisciplinary or synergistic opportunity that could link existing faculty or programs into a new configuration

- ideas springing from a review of the current Strategic Plan, state and ABOR performance metrics

- information from reviews of workforce trends and labor/employer/community studies (national and state data, Department of Labor and Georgetown study on state-specific projections, economic and social development studies, employer surveys, feedback from supervisors of student internships or community placements; reviews of program portfolios of sister universities and competitor institutions)

- systematic collection of expression of student interest (inquiries to Admissions, to deans, to Graduate College; data from entrance and exit surveys)

- establish systematic approach to collecting new ideas (eg periodic – annual? -- solicitation of ideas from college leadership or alumni councils, from Foundation Board members, from regional economic development and community development entities); consider annual formal call to university community for soliciting new proposals

**2. Initial review and vetting process**

- Idea transmitted to PALC through dean, chair (through ACC director), Faculty Senate (through President), vice provost, or any member of NAU community to Provost (directly or through a member of university Cabinet)

- Idea assigned to a PALC member to oversee initial quick review

- PALC member finds 2-4 individuals to assist in quick review – in most cases this would include the idea initiator or initial contact plus other persons with related interest or expertise (= “Provost Advisory Group” of working group discussions; note this is not a single group to cover multiple suggestions, but a group suited to a fair review of each particular suggestion)

- group reviews idea according to following “filters” –

- if this program were successfully added, would it appear to have a positive impact on university priorities (strategic goals) and performance?

- are there preliminary data to suggest a likelihood of true student demand or value to the state (that is, are there any substantive employer or workforce or student demand data)?

- are there any substantial legal, statutory, or political barriers to establishing such a program at NAU (eg conflict with Arizona statutes, duplication of responsibilities assigned to UA)?

**3. Establishment of working group to review**

The small group should complete its quick review in 30 (60?) days and report back to PALC. If the answers to the three key questions reveal positive possibilities and no negative indicators, then the Provost shall appoint a larger working group (the “Provost’s Advisory Group” including those who initiated the concept, volunteers from units most likely to be involved or affected, and others with relevant expertise as the Provost determines) to develop a formal proposal.

**B. Response to opportunities for new market niches**

As noted in the previous section, we recognize that many members of the university community, from faculty up through the central administration, may have the opportunity to identify important new niches for the university. After the initial proposal of a program, a careful evaluation by the Provost’s Advisory Group should include the following steps:

- evaluate the program with respect to the university’s current Strategic Plan, mission, and ABOR 2020 goals, to articulate alignment with existing mission and objectives;

- inventory similar programs within the state and region (especially those offered by public institutions) as part of an environmental scan;

- summarize information on student demand and/or workforce needs that provide some estimation of projected enrollment growth and student numbers for the proposed program;

- consult with external constituencies who can provide information on useful aspects of course or program design, and potentially contribute as technical advisors, providers of clinical or internship placements, etc.;

- summarize information on potential competitive advantage this program would offer NAU specifically;

- estimate the lead time necessary to launch the program;

- summarize the resources needed to start up and to operate the program (see section E).

***[Potential goal: creation of a rubric against which the Provost’s Advisory Group and the administration can evaluate each of these factors and come to a recommendation.]***

1. Evaluate the program with respect to the current NAU Strategic Plan, mission, and ABOR 2020 goals

a. To which institutional and ABOR goals would a successful program in this area contribute?

b. Would the proposed program join existing efforts addressing a particular goal, or would it be a significant novel expansion of university capacity in some way?

2. Inventory similar programs within the state and region (especially those offered by public institutions)

a. What similar programs are offered at Arizona’s public institutions? Consider undergraduate and graduate programs, certificates, campus-based vs. on-line offerings.

b. Are there private institutions (either non-profit or for-profit) offering similar degree programs?

c. Are other regional institutions offering similar degree programs?

d. What are the “prices” or estimated student costs for similar degree programs in those other settings? This will be a crucial element in evaluating the potential for NAU to establish a viable competitive program.

3. Summarize information on projected student demand, workforce needs, and estimated enrollments

a. Identify gaps and trends in the workforce and discipline

i. National: review workforce projections reports by Department of Labor, Georgetown study on state-specific projections, etc.

ii. Regional/State: review program inventories from sister, peer, and regional institutions, review regional/state workforce needs.

iii. Use information gathered from employer surveys of NAU graduates.

iv. Promote, and collect feedback from, on-the-job education through projects in partnership with business, government, & non-profits (cf. FOR, COE, COM, CCS) (See Ball State University as a potential model)

b. Identify student interest/demand

#### i. Determine current interest and demand among current and incoming students (graduate and undergraduate)

#### ii. Consider targets for New Programming to help students meet the demands of the workplace. Equip students for career adaptability: skills in identifying valid & relevant info; analysis and problem-solving

#### iii. Prepare students to actively participate in a democracy with a focus on knowledge base “needed to be informed” & effective citizen-legislators.

#### iv. Modify university record-keeping processes to count double-majors, major-minor combos, and other credential sets (vs. current practice of only recording one major per student, and missing data on double & second majors, etc.) to get a more accurate picture of NAU current patterns of enrollment to drive new decisions.

4. Consult with external constituencies who can provide information on useful aspects of course or program design.

a. Identify relevant constituencies and potential partners, from accrediting and professional or trade organizations to regional employers and alumni working in relevant fields

b. Survey relevant constituencies regarding desirable aspects of an educational or training program, and incorporate into curricular design and planning

c. Survey relevant constituencies for interest and ability to contribute to support of program (e.g., provision of internship opportunities, service on an advisory board, financial or in-kind contributions to start-up investments for program)

5. Review and summarize information on potential competitive advantage this program would offer NAU specifically. Marketing expertise can be a critical supplement in this process.

a. Can and will other institutions be able to offer the same program less expensively, more comprehensively, and more quickly (Section “c”, below), etc. that would make our entry problematic? b. What do we currently offer that can be leveraged to develop a better program? What areas are we already known for, in which we can add logically supplementary programming?

c. What does our unique location provide as a natural area of program development (e.g., environmental fields, cultural intersections)?

6. Estimate the lead time necessary to launch the program. It is necessary to assess how quickly we can implement a program. We want to be an “early provider” of a program to help establish our market position. Questions to ask include: Are there barriers that would preclude us from moving quickly? Are the major new resource investments a matter of facility construction or modification (relatively slow), accreditation (can be slow), hiring (can be somewhat expedited), or reallocation of current resources (could be relatively fast)? Is there a likelihood that the market or interest in this new program has only a short lifespan? That is, will the market quickly be saturated by the production of a few cohorts of graduates, or will other educational providers be getting into this market soon?

## 7. Summarize the resources needed for startup and for operations of the proposed program. It is critical that we have the resources necessary to offer a new program such as financial considerations, staff, space, equipment, and existing faculty strengths. Questions to ask include: Do we have (or reasonably sure we can rapidly obtain) sufficient resources to implement a new curriculum? See Section E of this framework for a complete treatment of this issue.

# 8. Other Considerations to Facilitate Success of New Academic Program Planning

a. Avoid generic or purchased programming; generate unique knowledge-product here. b. Design appropriate marketing strategies, which should be created in consultation with program experts who know the market for their field.

## c. Review administrative structures that are potential barriers to adding new programs.

## d. . Allow for experimentation and possibly a 3 year trial period allowing failure and nimbleness to encourage innovative programming.

## e. Make it possible and attractive for faculty to shift over to other areas related to their skills.

**C. Identification of areas of current strength and competitive advantage that might be useful foundations for a new program or for expansion**

Our goal is to provide a framework that others can use to guide future growth and decision-making processes during academic program development, with an emphasis on how to go about identifying NAU’s strengths, distinctiveness, and areas of competitive advantage. We envisioned our group’s charge as less about the metrics used to assess the quality of specific academic program performance and more about identifying and communicating ways in which academic and institutional strengths and competitive advantage can be recognized. We also resisted the approach of looking to standard sets of measures used to evaluate specific programs or institutions. Instead, looking externally, we considered the university’s ability to attract people, interest, and support. We began by identifying some current areas of distinction, and through reverse engineering we asked questions such as, “How do we know that is an area of distinction?” “How do we prove that is an area of strength and/or competitive advantage?”, and “What resources could we identify to answer the two previous questions?”

As we develop our framework, we want it to be forward looking, focusing on the areas already identified in the NAU strategic plan and leveraging the work of the Strategic Planning Council. We emphasize the significance of referring to the NAU strategic plan, not just because it reflects institutional strengths and areas of distinction, but also because the strategic plan is a living document that accurately mirrors the evolution of our institution. As the plan evolves, so can our framework for academic planning. We also want to make our framework sustainable, recommending resources in such a way that they do not require frequent updating. For example, identify resources or areas to consult, not specific items, documents, or people.

We believe that our framework may be parallel to a marketing plan, in which external stakeholders such as employers, prospective students and their families, prospective faculty and staff, donors, as well as current NAU students, faculty, and staff are all included as crucial to identifying institutional areas of distinction. External as well as internal recognition is a necessary part of identifying our strengths and competitive advantages.

1. Working from our strategic plan, identify the units and programs that are central to our strategic goals.

-- Identify which of these or other units or programs receive significant, consistent regional and national recognition for a particular area (data from Public Affairs). Agree which external benchmarks could be used (media recognition, peer opinions, external evaluations by professional organizations, etc.).

-- Identify areas of high sponsored project activity and the programs that support them.

-- Identify areas of high productivity in scholarly activity and the programs that support them.

-- Identify areas/factors of the campus and the region that attract students to NAU, what factors cause prospective students to come to NAU (data from EMSA, Marketing). Identify the cultural, climatic, geographic, physical and environmental characteristics that attract these students.

-- Identify characteristics of the NAU student population that students find attractive (alumni in the family, veterans-friendly campus, high percentage of non-traditional students, interest in outdoors activities, etc.). Agree upon how many students constitute a significant number for the purpose of identifying these areas.

-- Identify programs that meet our shared ideals for higher education (e.g. high percentage of graduation rates for students and student athletes, participation in scholarly or professional activities outside of the class room, graduates are working in their major fields of study, community engagement).

-- Identify key reasons that alums and donors give to NAU (data from Advancement).

Potential Resources for the Identification of Competitive Advantage

Use the PARTICULAR expertise of each of these groups to focus on our specific identification tasks. Ask for empirical data that each of these groups/units might have:

* Faculty/staff, students to identify additional criteria and also to identify areas according to the criteria listed above
* College Advisory Councils
* Center for International Education (global engagement)
* NAU Marketing: external perceptions of NAU
* EMSA: information on how/why students decide to come to NAU
* NAU-specific surveys of students that ask student to recognize what they feel are areas of distinction
* Graduate College: information on how/why graduate students decide to come to NAU
* Advancement: information on why donors and alums give to NAU and what they value about NAU
* Environmental Caucus: where are our strengths in sustainability
* ITEP and Native American Cultural Center, Native American Advisory Council: what is our strength in recruiting Native American students and tribal partnerships
* VP Research: areas of sponsored project and scholarly activity strengths, areas of research opportunities for our students
* Alumni Affairs: in what areas are our graduates getting jobs; what are the institutional characteristics most valued by our alumni
* PAIR: metrics in which we compare favorably with our peer institutions
* National Accrediting and Professional Bodies

For each group, pose these questions:

\* “How do we know an area is one of distinction?”

\* “How do we prove that is an area of strength and/or competitive advantage?” ,

\* “What additional resources can we use to answer the two previous questions?”

**D. Measuring and documenting the quality and effectiveness of a program**

The university has many justifications for seeking concrete measures of the quality and impact of its academic programs. Academic program review and, in the case of programs seeking external professional accreditation, accreditation reviews afford regular opportunities to evaluate the quality of a program. Taking advantage of these opportunities to arrive at an understanding of actual program quality and effectiveness provides us with improved ability to make decisions about where resource investments are needed. Articulating measures of quality or impact is of great assistance in fundraising, preparation of external grant proposals, and marketing – all necessary aspects of building and sustaining university programs. Finally, proposing specific measures for assessing the quality and success of a new program being proposed will assist the university in making decisions about new investment and in determining whether a new initiative is delivering on its vision.

In this section we review a number of categories in which program quality and impact may be measured, and propose multiple measures or indicators that could be used to assess quality within each category. Please note that unit mission and profile will determine which categories and measures/indicators are most applicable. Not every category will apply to every program; not every measure/indicator will apply to every program; and other indicators, not listed here, may apply or be more useful for a given program. Still, we expect that each program can and will identify at least several measures of quality and will follow through to incorporate periodic assessment and reporting of these measures in its program reviews or similar exercises.

## Student Learning

## NAU strategic goal: Promote high levels of student access, engagement, achievement, and affordability

Evidence of Student Learning and Continual Improvement Practices for Curriculum and Assessment

Sample measures and indicators include:

* Mission & Purpose of a Degree Program
* Degree Program Student Learning Outcomes
* Curriculum Design with a Curriculum Map
* Strategic Course Learning Design which supports Degree Program Student Learning Outcomes
* Systematic Assessment of Degree Program Student Learning Outcomes
* Use of Assessment Findings for Continual Improvement

Contributions to the Student Experience

Sample measures and indicators include:

* Integration of high-impact practices (such as, First Year Learning Initiative)
* Contribution to the first year learning experience through participation in First Year Seminar and course offerings in Liberal Studies (such as ENG 105 and MAT).
* Engagement in teaching writing-intensive courses and development of teaching techniques appropriate to writing
* Contributions to the cultural and intellectual life of the campus
* Integration of academic and co-curricular programming through the use of learning communities
* Promotion of undergraduate student participation in research, creative, and professional activities
* Mentorship of students
* Participation in the University Honors Program
* Integration of service learning, community-based learning, or internships into the curriculum
* Capstone projects engage students in integrative, high impact learning experience

Contributions to University-wide Curriculum

* Articulation of learning opportunities tailored to the achievement of university learning outcomes
* Articulation of learning opportunities designed to increase skills desired by employers
* Engagement in University-wide endeavors such as: Global Learning Initiative, Liberal Studies, Diversity, Information Literacy/ Fluency (e.g., Cline Library), Technological Literacy
* Engagement in multi-disciplinary, integrative collaborations

Student Progress to Degree

* Retention of students through the completion of the degree
* Pathways for transfer students and retention through completion of the degree
* Documentation of student success (DFW trends and efforts to increase student success)
* Examination of achievement gaps across student groups (efforts to reduce gaps)

Achievements of Graduates

* Documentation of alumni accomplishments (e.g., employment, graduate school)
* Engagement with alumni

## Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity

## NAU strategic goal: Expand the boundaries of knowledge to improve lives

Research productivity, scholarship productivity, and creative activity

* Number of publications, conference presentations, etc.
* Number of shows/concerts/productions
* Number of grants submitted/ Number of grants funded (level of funding)
* Interdisciplinary activities that enrich research, scholarly, creative potential
* Inter-university collaborations that broaden research, scholarly, creative expertise
* Large-scale collaborative research, scholarly, creative projects
* High-risk, high impact research and early-stage innovation
* International research or scholarly collaborations in areas that benefit the university and the state
* The application of research/scholarly results or “outcomes” to address real-world issues
* Recognition/awards to individuals, teams of outstanding researchers, scholars, artists and innovators)

**Contributions to University Strategic Goals: Global engagement**

NAU strategic goal:Advance the internationalization of the university to prepare students for global citizenship

* Preparation of students to become globally competent graduates
* Documentation of global learning in the majors, the liberal studies program and learning experiences outside the classroom
  + Curriculum designed to develop and incorporate global perspectives and global learning experiences in terms of the themes of diversity, sustainability and global engagement
  + Assessment of Global Learning outcomes
* Development of teaching and research partnerships with partner institutions worldwide
* Creation of artistic, scientific, and cultural experiences with partners across the globe

## Contributions to University Strategic Goals: Diversity

## NAU goal: Promote issues of diversity, civility, democracy, citizenship, and community engagement and collaboration

* Engagement in diversity initiatives focused on underrepresented groups
* Creation of opportunities for diverse groups to share their perspectives and knowledge
* Development of universally designed environments and engagement in teaching approaches and methods for inclusion

Contributions to Public Service

* Engagement in discipline and profession of the field/ discipline of the academic program
  + Association membership (regional, national, and international)
  + Conference/organization activity
* Service to the local and global community and results of that service/ engagement
  + Partnerships with the business, non-profit and entrepreneurial sectors to address regional economic vitality.
  + Record of service to the local and global community and results that were achieved through service (changes made in organizations, implementation of new approaches, effects of engagement, etc.)
* Teaching that incorporates civic engagement
  + Development of experiential learning opportunities for citizenship, engagement, and civility across the curriculum.
  + Development of projects, programs, and initiatives that engage students, faculty, and staff with local communities in relationships that promote the public good, deepen values of active citizenship, and support greater cooperation among diverse communities
  + Development of integral connections between local, national, and global learning opportunities for civic engagement
* Research that intersects with service and engagement
  + Engagement with partners to address regional economic vitality, environmental stewardship, urban-rural social well-being, and cultural understanding
  + Generation of new knowledge associated with the unique cultural, socioeconomic and environmental issues that are important to Northern Arizona communities

## Contributions to University Strategic Goals: Native Americans NAU strategic goal: Become one of the nation’s leading universities serving Native Americans

* Development and expansion of curricula that focus on and address Native American experiences
* Engagement in collaborative service and outreach programs with Native American communities
* Development and enhancement of partnerships with tribal governments and others that benefit Native American students, researchers, faculty, and communities
* Engagement in finding approaches that incorporate Native American traditional knowledge and practices

**Categories Not Linked to a Specific NAU Strategic Goal**

Programmatic leadership - Leadership and service focused upon achieving sustainable results, promoting healthy change and innovation, and fostering collaborative relationships

* Documentation of awards received nationally and internationally that increase NAU’s prominence and visibility
* Programmatic leadership that fosters collaborative relationships
  + Identification and achievement of goals, that are aligned with the mission and vision of a department, and the University
  + Promotion of healthy change and innovation
  + Demonstration of integrity in decisions and commitments
  + Encouragement of civil discourse with our learning and working environments
* Service to the University and results of that service/ engagement
  + Engagement in collaborative initiatives across the university
* Intentional use of blended and other technology-enhanced course designs to increase student achievement, conserve faculty effort, and optimize use of facilities

Program climate, morale

Prominence, visibility

**E. Projecting and planning for the resource needs for a new program or expansion, or reviewing the resource needs for an existing program**

In an era of diminished state appropriation and increased student/family burden for the expense of offering high-quality academic programs, we must be cognizant of the many real costs and of the potential role of non-state resources. An inadvertent omission of some key need in early planning, or a willingness to shortchange a program’s true needs in order to keep it going, can be very detrimental to the continued success and health of program and university. This section of the framework puts forward a comprehensive list of items to be considered, both during the startup phase of a new program and during the ongoing operational phase. While a given program may not require each and every one of these items, it is best to review the list in a formal way to ensure that appropriate attention is being given to the true resource needs of the program. Suggestions are also provided for alternative means of addressing certain needs; these should be considered and analyzed explicitly before making commitments about the launch or modification of a program. Finally, this section closes with reference to the revenue side; suggestions are included for basic considerations relevant to all-funds budgeting of a program and alternatives to a fully state-and-tuition basis of funding.

Key questions addressed in this section include:

\* What are the key resources (faculty, staff, facilities, technology, operations budget) required for a program and what are reasonable guidelines for estimating resource needs for a program?

\* Where can technology contribute to reducing aspects of cost (facilities, classroom time, provision of services or of opportunities for practice with feedback, etc.) and allowing the increased investment of faculty time in high-value interactions with students and scholarly work?

\* How do we assess whether a particular course (or set of learning objectives) is most effectively delivered by a particular modality (on-line, blended, face-to-face)?

\* How do we use the assets of the Flagstaff campus most effectively to sustain high-quality programs and academic success in a sustainable financial model?

\* How do we incorporate attention to the current state or ABOR performance metrics and/or funding model?

We have attempted to spell out separately those costs associated with the development and initial launch of a program (startup funds, in essence) and those costs associated with the operation and sustaining of an existing program. It is noted that the institution should consider identifying a pool of funds that could be set aside specifically to assist with new program development or startup.

Analyzing and Planning Resource Needs for Academic Programs

General Overview of Resource Requirements

Startup costs

Startup costs are non-recurring, one-time costs associated with the program and program personnel.

\* Recruitment costs for:

\* Administration/Leadership

\* Faculty

\* Staff

\* Facilities

\* Space build-out

\* Furnishings

\* Technology, including computers, instructional, videoconferencing, etc.

\* Software

\* Peripherals (printers, scanners, etc.)

\* Marketing and promotion

\* Library resources/service

\* Laboratory (instructional, research)

\* Equipment

\* Computing equipment

\* Software

\* Other (specify)

Recurring Costs

\*Annual personnel costs (salary + ERE)

Expenses in this section estimate recurring annual expenses for academic and support personnel as well as program leadership (such as directors). Student personnel such as undergraduate peer teaching assistants and graduate teaching, research and support assistants should also be included. Appropriate ERE should be included in these estimates. Example categories of personnel are provided below. This list is not intended to be exhaustive. Further, not all examples below are applicable to all programs.

Administration

\* Program director

\* Academic coordinator

Faculty (Note: You may have multiple entries for each type. For example, your program may require a mix of senior and junior tenure/tenure-track faculty.)

\* Full-time, tenure/tenure-track

\* Full-time, non-tenure-track

\* Part-time

Staff

\* Administrative assistant(s) or associates

\* Technical support personnel

\* Program coordinator(s)

\* Clinical coordinator(s)

\* Tutor(s)

\* Lab coordinator(s)

\* Academic advisors

Student personnel

\* Undergraduate

\* Graduate (please keep in mind tuition, health insurance, other benefits – especially important not to forget these if the funds being used are not state funds or do not otherwise carry automatic coverage of benefits)

\* Tutoring (e.g., SIs and PTAs)

\* Operational costs (non-personnel)

Operational costs are costs that are expected to recur annually. These costs do not include salary and ERE, but do include costs of supporting faculty, staff and students.

Faculty support

\* Travel

\* Professional development

\* Subscriptions and membership fees

Staff support

\* Travel

\* Professional development

\* Subscriptions and membership fees

Research support

\* Equipment Depreciation

\* Laboratory supplies

\* Equipment Maintenance

\* Software

\* Data

\* Other

Marketing, promotion and recruiting

\* Program marketing and promotion

\* Student recruiting

\* Special events

Comment [TSA2]: Depreciation of plant and equipment is an important component of an operating budget. It highlights the decline in the value of assets as a result of use and obsolescence. While strict cash flows are critical for liquidity analysis I believe the inclusion of depreciation provides a better assessment of ongoing operations.

General operations

\* Supplies

\* Equipment depreciation

\* Equipment maintenance

\* Software

\* Other

Facilities (space)

Note: Technical complexity and room type should be considered. For example, depreciation and maintenance may be higher in technology-enhanced classrooms.

\* Depreciation

\* Facilities leasing

\* Planned and preventive facilities maintenance

\* Corrective facilities maintenance

\* Utilities

\* Custodial services

Tuition remission

Student tuition Regent’s Set Aside (RSA)

Student fee RSA

Other (specify)

Impact on other units

Does the proposed program impact other units? If so, describe the:

\* Nature of the impact:

o Facilities

o Courses

o Other

\* Magnitude of the impact

\* Estimated costs to the other unit(s)

\* Plans for compensating the other units(s)

Revenue

Note: While tuition projections are important, this does not imply that the revenue will return directly to the program. In most cases tuition returns to the general or central budget, from which state support is allocated to the operations of programs.

Resident tuition revenue (regular semester)

\* Graduate

\* Undergraduate

Non-resident tuition revenue (regular semester)

\* Graduate

\* Undergraduate

Resident tuition revenue (winter, summer terms)

\* Graduate

\* Undergraduate

Non-resident tuition revenue (winter, summer terms)

\* Graduate

\* Undergraduate

Student fee revenue

\* Graduate

\* Undergraduate

Research revenue

\* Direct funding projected

\* Indirect cost recovery projected

Donated funds (Note: This includes private donations and operational (non-research) grants.)

\* Restricted funds (include brief description of restrictions)s

\* Un-restricted funds

Others

Contribution to ABOR Metrics

Performance funding model

ABOR’s revised Performance Funding Model is an output-based model that is primarily based on changes in three areas:

\* Retention of students

\* Production of graduates

\* Research and public service funding

While the university does not currently assign explicit responsibilities for performance on these metrics to specific units, we acknowledge that this may ultimately be necessary if state emphasis on performance funding increases in future. At any rate, units should be cognizant of the relationship between their own activities and performance, and the university’s overall progress in performance metrics.

In addition to metrics related to the performance funding model, ABOR track the metrics shown below. (For details of ABOR performance metrics, see https://webapp6.asu.edu/corda/dashboards/ABOR\_public/main.dashxml)

\* Freshman retention rate

\* Degrees awarded (all levels)

\* 6-year graduation rate

\* Employment of graduates who stay in AZ

\* Community engagement activities impact

\* Degrees awarded in high-demand fields

\* Diversity of graduates

\* Patents issued

\* Intellectual property income

Qualitative Considerations

There are qualitative considerations that should be taken into account when evaluating proposals. A non-exhaustive list of appropriate qualitative considerations is provided below.

\* Please describe how you considered the role of technology in reducing costs (for example, increasing program enrollment capacity without sacrificing effectiveness) and allowing faculty to spend more time on 1) high-value interactions with students and 2) scholarly work.

\* What instructional modalities (online, blended, face-to-face) were considered for each course? Please provide a brief rationale for the modalities chosen. Considerations should include: potential for serving both Flagstaff and EC students; demonstrated or projected relative effectiveness of the course design in the proposed modality; cost effectiveness of the course in this versus alternative modalities (see point above)

\* Does the program or change propose to use Flagstaff “slack” resources? If so, please identify and document the availability of those resources.

***[Potential goal: develop and insert a spreadsheet template, with examples and helpful resources, for use in developing and presenting these budget and resource estimates]***

**F. How units (as well as the Provost’s Office) will use this framework over next few years**

1. In academic program reviews or accreditation reviews, we expect that programs will explicitly identify several relevant measures of program quality that they are focused on assessing and improving. These measures should reflect priorities and vision articulated in the unit’s strategic plan and related to the way in which the unit contributes to the mission of its college and the university as a whole. We anticipate that explicit consideration of these quality measures will be used in shaping a program’s stated learning outcomes and, eventually, curricular design.

2. In proposals or requests for new resources (whether staffing requests to the provost’s office or a request for a new class or program fee or a proposal for startup funds for some new effort), the template and list presented here will be used to assure the broadest possible consideration of resource needs. The request will be supported and justified by a link to the specific measures of program quality to be affected by the investment.

3. Proposals for new degree programs or other academic initiatives will be accompanied by justifications presenting evidence from the section above.

4. As colleges, departments, and programs become more active in philanthropic fundraising and advancement efforts, they will be able to make increasing use of the measures of quality outlined above (both to describe the hoped-for impact and to provide feedback to supporters on progress made).

5. Interactions between Marketing, Public Affairs, and academic units wishing to document the competitive advantage or position of their program(s) will generate additional and more effective examples of impact that raise the university’s public profile and fundraising capacity.