

## APRIP Sub-team Report to UMS CAOs

January 2015

Sub-team academic discipline \_\_\_\_\_

Your sub-team has the opportunity to shape the future organization and operation of your academic discipline within the UMS. Your charge is to recommend changes that leverage academic resources across UMS universities to increase program quality, student access, and fiscal benefits (revenues and/or savings). Although you may find and recommend short-term opportunities (and should include these in your report), it is expected that your sub-team's recommendations will have impact primarily in the 2016-17 or 2017-18 budget years.

### Report Format and Notes:

- 1-2 page Executive Summary
- 15-page document limit
- Sub-team member names with institution and titles
- Supporting documentation (may be contained in appendices and not count towards document page limit)
- One set of recommendations that, preferably, balances the three major categories of quality, access and financial sustainability
- If available, actual costs and revenues for recommendations. (If not available, the CAOs may arrange to obtain financial data for promising recommendations.)

Please ensure that the following areas are addressed.<sup>1</sup>

### A. Quality

- Indicate collaboration success to date between institutions that improve quality of the academic offering
- Indicate opportunities through collaboration to increase quality and ensure programmatic relevance of academic offerings (e.g. meeting labor force needs, increasing relevance of individual concentrations, deepening program offerings, etc.)
- Indicate challenges in achieving quality goals and possible solutions to meet these challenges

---

<sup>1</sup> We understand that there could be much more energy around expansions and opportunities than around cost-savings and efficiencies. **Our current reality is we need both.** Any growth plans must be accompanied by the assumptions and data that would convince a neutral outsider of the upside potential and costs to achieve it.

## **B. Access**

- Indicate collaboration success to date between institutions that improve access of the academic offering
- Indicate opportunities through collaboration to increase access for potential students at appropriate levels (e.g. associate, undergraduate, graduate)
- Indicate challenges in achieving access goals and possible solutions to meet these challenges

## **C. Financial**

- Identify possible savings and potential impact of inter-campus collaboration in the discipline. Financial savings categories may include, but are not limited to: (a) administrative costs; (b) instructional costs; (c) space usage and infrastructure; (d) delivery modalities; (e) technologies/equipment; (f) potential program revisions.

Examples of financial savings through collaboration have been found in:

- Better communication and alignment that reduces frustration, increases morale and prevents duplication or dead-end efforts
  - Reduction of redundancy through shared competencies
  - Reduction of FTE numbers that don't align with demand
  - Elimination of processes that don't add value and are not required by law
  - More efficient or effective ways to do a process
- Identify opportunities to grow UMS enrollments or increase non-tuition revenues (include supporting evidence)

## **D. Institutional Perspectives of all Relevant Stakeholders**

Each campus (UM, UMA, UMF, UMFK, UMM, UMPI, USM) has an opportunity to optionally indicate how the academic area aligns with its distinct mission. Responses are limited to 250 words per institution.