I. **Background and Purpose**
1.1. The purpose of this policy is to establish UW-Superior campus protocols for implementing the following:

- UW System Policy 102 Section 3.1 Eliminating an Academic Degree Type
- UW System Policy 102 Section 3.2 Renaming or Redirecting an Academic Degree Program including renaming and redirecting an academic degree program
- UW System Policy 102 Section 3.3 Suspending Admissions to an Academic Degree Program including all sub-sections related to suspension and reinstatement
- UW-System Policy 102 Section 3.4 Eliminating an Academic Degree Program
- UW System Policy 102 Section 6.3 on Monitoring Academic Degree Programs
- Regent Policy 20-24 related to Procedures relating to Financial Emergency or Program Discontinuance Requiring Faculty Layoff and Termination

1.2. This policy follows through with the October 2019 Memorandum to Faculty Senate at UW-Superior regarding program suspensions, under review, reinstatements and administrative toolkit option

1.3. The purpose of this policy is to clarify the expectations, process and steps in implementing the above UW System policies through advising and consultation.

1.4. This policy also will encourage high quality teaching and learning, engage in proactive, deliberate and planful strengthening of all academic programs at UW-Superior, and support efforts to continuously improve recruitment and retention of students to build fiscal solidity and enrollment potentials in a positive manner.

II. **Constraints**
None

III. **Definitions**
1.2 PBC Dashboard: the annual academic program review metrics, goals and reporting created by the Faculty Senate Planning and Budgetary Council (PBC)
1.2 Academic program: all majors and minors at UW-Superior
1.3 PBC: Planning and Budgetary Council of Faculty Senate
1.4 Quantitative metrics: key performance indicators (KPI’s) that measure academic program performance in numerical ways
1.5. Qualitative indicators: key performance indicators (KPI’s) that provide alternative ways of examining the value-added or contributions of an academic program to UW-Superior

IV. **Policy and Procedure Statements**
1.1 All academic programs will receive annual reports from the UW-Superior Faculty Senate Planning and Budgetary Council (PBC) through the PBC Dashboard process and through administrative notice about any UW System Policy 6.3 Low Enrolling Program status findings.
1.2 All PBC Dashboard metrics that are reported are relevant, appropriate and measurable. It is the duty of PBC, in consultation with Faculty Senate, administration and department chairs, to determine any changes in metrics.
   1.2.1 Administration in consultation with PBC will set the specific UWS goals with a review every two years.
1.2.2 PBC will establish the threshold ranges related to the coding schemes below and included in the annual PBC Dashboard.

1.2.3 PBC with administrative involvement will review the efficacy and appropriateness of the metrics every two years and ensure that it is considering current indicators that reflect Regent Policy 20-24 or other relevant emerging criteria.

1.3 The most significant quantitative metrics that would lead to the coding to follow captures information related to programmatic student demand, resource efficiency, and student success and degree completion, including:

1.3.1 Number of declared majors and minors in the program by year with five years of data;

1.3.2 Student credit hour production divided by faculty and instructional full-time equivalent (FTE);

1.3.3 Average number of graduates per year in past five years with five years of data;

1.3.4 Other PBC Dashboard metrics are to be used to further deepen the analysis of what is happening in an academic program.

1.4 The PBC Dashboard will add coding to signal to academic programs high performance and concern areas by the following:

1.4.1 “Red”: this is a signal that the academic program has not met a significant quantitative metric stated above in 1.3 and this should signal the need for an immediate meeting between administration, PBC members and the academic program members to discuss the metric results and diagnose next steps with action plans to strengthen program performance;

1.4.2 “Yellow”: this is a signal that the academic program has variable performance or is demonstrating a downward trend or if the metric scores remain static near the goal level over time on any one significant quantitative metric in 1.3 and this should signal the need for a meeting between PBC, administration and the academic program members to discuss the metric(s) and/or provide resources to strengthen and enhance program performance;

1.4.3 “Green”: this is a signal that the academic program has met or exceeded performance on all quantitative metrics in 1.3. This signal will be acknowledged by administration through direct communication to exchange insights and explore future opportunities.

1.4.4 For purposes of the Red, Yellow and Green signals, the above specified metrics in 1.3 are significant but all PBC established metrics are valuable for additional information and understanding of the program.

1.4.4.1 PBC will publish its annual PBC Dashboard findings within Faculty Senate, to administration and to all department chairs as a commitment to transparency of academic program performance.

1.4.4.2 The academic program when receiving a “red” or “yellow” signal may opt at their choice to summarize and present a case explaining their qualitative contributions to UW-Superior. The purpose of this qualitative indicator “case” will be to situate the role of the program as being essential to the university despite the “red” or “yellow” signals received on quantitative metrics. The operating assumption should be that all academic programs are expected to perform well or reasonably under the PBC quantitative metrics unless there is an excellent and unique reason why qualitative performance is sufficient.

1.4.4.2.1 The administration has the discretion to recognize the inherent value of an academic program under its qualitative performance and to not proceed to further steps unless directed to do so by UW System because of low enrolling program status.

1.4.4.2.2 Should the administration grant this exemption due to qualitative performance, it will present that finding and the time limitations to PBC and Faculty Senate with its rationale for doing so.

1.4.4.2.3 Should UW System Low Enrolling Program status activate despite an administrative finding regarding qualitative performance, administration will need to follow UW System protocol.

1.4.4.2.4 The case should include a combination of the following (these are not
1.4.4.2.4.1 Contributions to community engagement with data to demonstrate impact or contribution
1.4.4.2.4.2 Contributions to workforce development, career pathways or direct contribution to benefit the region
1.4.4.2.4.3 Contributions to raising the marketing profile of UW-Superior through events or other outreach efforts
1.4.4.2.4.4 Unique and impactful teaching and learning practices that are new, cutting edge and reflective of proven best practices that are woven into the academic curriculum and linked to improving recruitment and retention of students to enhance student success at UW-Superior
1.4.4.2.4.5 Contribution to the mission of UW-Superior that are unique to the academic program
1.4.4.2.4.6 Research, scholarly and creative contributions that can raise the marketing profile of the university or contribute to recruitment and retention efforts
1.4.4.2.4.7 Demonstrated recent history of raising impactful and significant funds through the Foundation or generates grants or revenue to support their programming or the university as a whole
1.4.4.2.4.8 Other factors to be agreed to between administration, PBC and the academic program

1.5 The PBC Dashboard reports are with “red” and “yellow” findings are cause for concern and require an intervention with PBC, academic program members and administration in order to get ahead of concern areas.

1.5.1 The review meeting will be held immediately if the category is “red” and within the semester “yellow” after the PBC Dashboard results have been published.
1.5.2 There will be development of concrete steps and an action plan on how to strengthen program performance.
1.5.3 There will be ongoing quarterly review meetings between administration, PBC and the academic program for an action period consisting of one complete academic cycle (fall to following summer) to ensure the program is taking concrete steps and following its action plan to achieve the goals and changing the indicators.
1.5.4 It is the responsibility of the academic program to request any support or tools needed from the administrative toolkit contained in the October 2019 Memorandum in order to support their action plan for that one-year action period.
1.5.5 An academic program will have no more than one year to show considerable progress toward the agreed to markers of progress prior to the under review” step being activated.

1.6 For programs that have been identified with “red” findings or “yellow” findings became “red” findings and (under either scenario) have not made significant progress during the action year, the next steps of the continuous review and monitoring process will activate, and the program will be placed in “under review” status by UW-Superior administration. This is the first formal campus step toward suspension of an academic program.

1.6.1 The first step in being placed “under review” is a thorough analysis by administration and the program of the progress or lack of progress in the preceding action period and identification of necessary next steps.
1.6.2 “Under review” means that the academic program must engage in concrete action planning to improve its metrics of performance according to the PBC Dashboard.
1.6.3 The goal of “under review” status is to engage in deliberative and planful activity with appropriate collaborative campus partners to improve their performance in quantitative indicators.
1.6.4 The status of “under review” will exist for not more than two years (not to include the action year) to be determined at the discretion of administration. During this time, there will be quarterly check-in meetings between administration and the program on their progress.
Administration will be monitoring the 1.3 significant quantitative indicators to see significant progress and will work with the academic program provided there is progress. 1.6.4.1 During this time, the academic program should pursue options to engage in renaming, re-directing, re-construction, re-design, or re-purposing activity to either revitalize the academic program, reformat it, or build a new direction with a new independent academic program or an interdisciplinary blending.

1.6.5 The list of “under review” programs will be published each year by the Provost’s Office.

1.6.6 It is the duty of the academic program to follow their action plans and revise them as needed to repair any “red” indicators.

1.6.7 Once all mutually agreed to indicators are improved, the program will be removed from the “under review” list and be formally and publicly removed from the list to proceed without further administrative oversight although ongoing “yellow” indicators will be subject to earlier provisions.

1.7 If there has not been significant progress to strengthen academic program performance within the no more than two year under review period, the academic program will be suspended under UW System Policy 3.3. The action period and the “under review” period will be counted toward the five-year window provided for under UW System Policy 3.3.

1.7.1 The process content described in UW System Policy 3.3. absent the five-year timeclock will be followed in designating suspension status for an academic program.

1.7.2 The five-year time clock will become a two-year time clock with the previous three years counted in and will begin on the date of formal suspension.

1.7.2.1 The suspended academic program will engage in teach-out planning to ensure all students are served within the two-year window including planning for staffing changes.

1.7.2.2 The academic program will have no more than two years before elimination unless formal petition has been made and granted by the Chancellor for an extension due to extenuating unknown circumstances.

1.8 Once suspended, a suspended academic program may apply for reinstatement status to request a substantial redevelopment opportunity anytime during the final two-year window of suspension status. Reinstatement would require following UW System Policy 102 Section 3.3 criteria and demonstrating sufficient improvement to merit removal from suspension status. The following steps should be followed:

1.8.1 Step One: A program meets with program members to discuss their openness to pursuing reinstatement—the program must agree given the amount of time and energy required for this process.

1.8.2 Step Two: The program meets with their academic department and discusses the pro/cons of pursuing reinstatement given the resources required. After consideration of the program’s presentation, the department must pass a motion of support to move forward with a reinstatement request by the program.

1.8.3 Step Three: Once department approval is obtained, the program seeking reinstatement prepares a pre-proposal for presentation to the Dean and Provost (and perhaps Chancellor) for consultation and permission to proceed with the reinstatement process. The pre-proposal must address the following (3 single spaced pages maximum):

1.8.3.1 Describe initial ideas to change the curriculum that would show a new, contemporary and cutting-edge direction. Provide representative examples of programs from comparable institutions that show these types of curricula and how they serve students. Indicate any best practices (such as High Impact Practices—HIPs---or other experiential learning opportunities) that would comprise a critical program component.

1.8.3.2 Find and provide information that indicates this field of study and some related career fields are likely to experience growth potential at the national/regional or local level. This is not a full market analysis but it is a short research effort into your own discipline. Summarize any patterns and trends of likely student demand, or new factors that are
creating interest in your discipline different than the last 5-7 years.

1.8.3.3 Designate who will lead the reinstatement planning work and how program members will be involved

1.8.3.4 List the supports or resources you believe you will need to undertake this work and explain why it is not possible to do the work within the timeline under current load. Consider if faculty releases from any historically low-enrolling courses may be used to provide reassigned time for these efforts without negatively affecting students.

1.8.3.5 Develop a timeline of planning and implementation efforts that fits within any stated deadline. Plan to meet at least monthly with Dean or Associate Dean during the process to ensure administration and program alignment throughout design.

1.8.4 Step Four: Schedule a meeting with Dean and Provost for consultation and permission to proceed. Submit the pre-proposal at least a week in advance to allow time for review. The meeting will be a discussion about the information contained in the pre-proposal and will produce a yes or no authorization. The Dean and Provost reserves the option to consult with experts from Enrollment Management about the pre-proposal to obtain more background information from them to inform the administrative decision-making on the pre-approval.

1.8.4.1 To receive a yes, the pre-proposal and program members need to persuade the administration (Provost, Dean and Chancellor) of the following:

1.8.4.1.1 There are some reasonable indicators of enrollment growth potential in the discipline, particularly those tied to recent data;
1.8.4.1.2 There are one or more proposed curricular trajectories that will move it into a different place in the future if it is approved;
1.8.4.1.3 The program is feasible considering resource requests and proposed timeline

1.8.4.2 Persuasion is necessary given the background of being a suspended program and needing to demonstrate that there is, in fact, some potential for a turnaround in enrollment. Once the preproposal is reviewed and any other input obtained, the academic administration will generate a memorandum that clearly communicates their decision and any related parameters, such as resource commitments or other factors.

1.8.5 Step Five: If yes, the program goes to work. Proper contracts or resources are acquired in collaboration with administration. This will be the working period taking several months ensuring at least monthly communication with the Dean or Associate Dean. The program will be doing research, engaging in curricular design, working with any external consultants or experts, obtaining key data and planning the best implementation plans for the future success of the reinstated program. All of this work will be summarized in a final reinstatement proposal to be presented to Provost and Dean and possibly Chancellor prior to the submission to governance bodies. This proposal should include the following sections:

1.8.5.1 Full report on the conditions including:
1.8.5.1.1 Enrollment data report of national, Midwest and regional enrollment trends from reputable sources that demonstrate enrollment turnaround potentials likely to occur by May 2022 aiming at minimum of twelve (12) incoming new students for majors and 5 incoming new students for minors;
1.8.5.1.2 Significant curricular re-design based on comparable academic programs from other institutions;
1.8.5.1.3 Ongoing record of consultations and check-ins with academic administration on progress during the reinstatement design process;
1.8.5.1.4 Completion of all governance approval processes;
1.8.5.1.5 Development of clear implementation plans for rollout, admissions and enrollment turnarounds;
1.8.5.1.6 Planning to ensure no negative student impacts in future cycles in event of possible failure to maintain enrollment targets.
1.8.5.1.7 Comparable summary of what the suspended program curriculum was in the past as compared to the new proposed curriculum. Key differences and how they relate to enrollment success should be noted and explained.
1.8.5.1.8 Comparable data from other institutions who have thriving similar programs should be summarized and included as appendices.
1.8.5.1.9 Catalog copy prepared and ready for submission
1.8.5.1.10 New course proposals or any other changes that would require AP 1117 or AP 1601 review prepared and ready for submission
1.8.5.1.11 Summary of any research gathered from an advisory committee, focus groups, surveys or other efforts to gather market research related to enrollment or curricular design
1.8.5.1.12 Projected enrollments and two year course rotation for a 2-4 year window of time
1.8.5.1.13 All materials generally required for the faculty governance review process through UAAC, PBC and Faculty Senate

1.8.6 Step Six: When proposal work is completed, there will be one presentation meeting of the proposal to Provost/Dean to ensure administrative support prior to moving through governance process unless the Provost/Dean waive the presentation process. The Provost/Dean reserve the right to consult with Enrollment Management experts for their input prior to issuing final decision on the reinstatement request.

1.8.7 Step Seven: If the program receives final administrative approval to proceed, the program next moves through AP 1117 or AP 1601 in proper format through Faculty Senate within the university final deadline determined by administration.

1.8.8 Step Eight: Upon final approvals from governance and the Chancellor, the program will be formally reinstated and removed from suspension. It will immediately work with Admissions and prepares to recruit students and launch while monitoring enrollments and program performance over time.

1.9 If the academic program has not successfully turned itself around within the above specified under review period, the academic program will be eliminated under UW System Policy 3.4.
1.10 UW-Superior will respond to the official data report provided annually by UW System related to programs that have less than 25 graduates over a five-year period and provide comment as to the status of the program. This is required under UW System Policy 102 Section 6.3 on Monitoring Academic Degree Programs.

V. Compliance

5.1 Faculty Senate, Academic Staff Senate, appropriate councils, Instructors, and Department Chairs and Chancellor’s Staff are aware of this policy change.

VI. Attachments

7.1 Full integration of all appropriate UW System and Board of Regents policies related to program monitoring, review and actions noted above including but not limited to:

- UW System Policy 102 Section 3.1 Eliminating an Academic Degree Type
- UW System Policy 102 Section 3.2 Renaming or Redirecting an Academic Degree Program including renaming and redirecting an academic degree program
- UW System Policy 102 Section 3.3 Suspending Admissions to an Academic Degree Program including all sub-sections related to suspension and reinstatement
- UW-System Policy 102 Section 3.4 Eliminating an Academic Degree Program
- UW System Policy 102 Section 6.3 on Monitoring Academic Degree Programs
- Regent Policy 20-24 related to Procedures relating to Financial Emergency or Program Discontinuance Requiring Faculty Layoff of Termination