BOARD OF REGENTS
PRELIMINARY BPR TEAM REPORT

BPR TEAM: College of Science, Engineering and Technology

CHAIR: Dr. Steve Cobb, Dean

MEETING SCHEDULE: Every other Wednesday beginning 9/19/12, 3:30 pm.

PROGRAMS REVIEWED: 18 Academic Programs by CIP Code; 6 non-academic cost centers.

OVERVIEW OF ACTIVITY TO DATE:

The CSET BPR Team convened for the first time on Wednesday, Sept. 19, 2012 and met approximately every other week during the fall semester. The team decided that for the purposes of academic program review and prioritization, a "Program" would be defined as those undergraduate degree programs falling under a specific CIP code. Each graduate degree program would constitute a "Program" as well. The team adopted a set of metrics/inputs to guide in the assessment and prioritization of each Program in the five areas of Essentiality, Demand, Quality, Cost Effectiveness, and Opportunity. Those metrics include:

Essentiality

- Alignment with university/college mission
- Alignment with national/state goals and STEM initiatives
- Provision of academic courses to other majors; service role of program
- Economic Impact
- Responsiveness to identified areas of need

Demand

- Enrollment in program
- Graduation rates and trends
- Enrollment in service courses; credit hour generation
- Graduate/Professional opportunities for graduates

Quality

- Instruction in major or program (ex, from Senior Surveys)
- Graduate/Professional school matriculation
- Performance on national metrics within the discipline
- Accreditations; awards; recognitions
- Contribution to institution's reputation
- Placement rates
- Student academic profiles

Cost Effectiveness

- Ratio of credit hour generation to budgeted faculty
- Ratio of majors to faculty
- Ratio of total costs of delivery to faculty
- Equipment and space requirements
- Outside Resources/Gifts/Alumni giving; revenue generated

- Faculty Productivity and Output; Personnel costs

Opportunity

- Capacity for Growth
- Potential for online or alternative delivery formats resulting in savings
- Collaborative Vision; potential for key partnerships
- Ability to address projected area(s) of need

In this evaluation process, team members representing each academic department made recommendations for the ratings of Programs within their academic unit. The entire team discussed these recommendations and endorsed their acceptance or suggested modifications.

Based on the criteria, each Program was placed into one of three categories. A category 3 rating indicated that the Program is critical and essential to MSU/CSET mission and should be protected. Category 2 denoted Programs not viewed as absolutely essential, but important and desirable to the MSU/CSET mission and thus should be retained, perhaps with appropriate steps to ensure efficiency and cost effectiveness. Category 1 was reserved for Programs that were candidates for immediate restructuring or suspension, with reallocation of resources. It is important to note that Programs rated as "2" are those that, while not absolutely essential to the institutional mission, are significant in the value and quality they add to CSET and to MSU. These programs could be reduced or even eliminated and MSU would survive. However, their absence or reduction would result in a fundamentally different university in terms of its ability to meet its comprehensive mission to the region, attract quality students and faculty, and maintain our high academic reputation.

Upon completion of this evaluation of academic programs, team members were asked to turn their attention to the evaluation of non-degree cost centers including departmental/college operating budgets, research centers, and ancillary support units. The workgroup reviewed annual budget statements from each of CSET's six ancillary budget centers including the Watershed Studies Institute (WSI), the Hancock Biological Station (HBS), the Mid-America Remote Sensing Center (MARC), the Chemical Services Laboratory (CSL), the Engineering Institute, and the Science Resource Center (SRC). Recommendations were considered for efficiencies and cost savings in these areas.

Additional topics of discussion included cost savings in operational procedures including efficiencies in course section sizes, alternate delivery formats, and other administrative and departmental organizational arrangements. The disposition of retirement salary savings was also considered. In addition, the chair encouraged discussion of strategic goals, programmatic vision, new academic programs, and other areas of future growth and revenue generation.