

**E. 9. UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT
FOCUS 2010 IMPLEMENTATION TEAM 9**

Team Name:	Program Revision
Sponsor:	Provost, Robert Sedlak
Charge:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a reallocation model for the colleges and school. 2. Develop a system to centralize vacant positions to provide for comprehensive review process.
Outcome:	<p>Efficient and effective use of resources.</p> <p>Alignment of resources with program size providing for adequate performance in retention and graduation.</p>
Chairperson/Leader:	
Membership:	<p>CTEM Dean, Bob Meyer CAS Dean, John Murphy CHD Dean, John Wesolek SOE Dean, Judy Jax</p>
Consultants/ Resource People	<p>BPA Chancellor's memo of August 30, 2004 to Provost Sedlak</p>
Training/Information Needed:	
Method of Communication:	
Timeline:	October 2004

Focus 2010

Implementation Team 9

Team Name: Program Revision

Sponsor: Provost Robert A. Sedlak

Progress Report:

- Charge 1. Develop a reallocation model for the colleges and school.
- Charge 2. Develop a system to centralize vacant positions to provide for comprehensive review process.

Efficient and effective use of resources will be achieved through:

- Use of standardized FTE assignments for Department Chair and Program Director positions. We have standardized the allocation of time for program directors and their stipend. We have also revised their position descriptions and added metrics for evaluation.
- For Department Chairs we have created a position description and modeled formulas that are currently used at MNSCU and UW-River Falls. The Provost Council has not come to agreement yet on the formula for allocation but expect to do so in the next couple of meetings.
- Developing an equitable model for support office staff at the department and college/school level. We have modeled some formulas against current practice and are continuing discussion about needs.
- Use of a reallocation model that aligns resources with program/university need. As positions become available through retirement or resignations, the assignment of positions will be evaluated by the Provost, and reassigned to meet program and enrollment demands. We have looked at some ratios but will be working to development some principles for reallocation. We have made several reallocations as a result of the conversations. 1.0 FTE position and person was moved from CHD (H and T department) to CTEM (Business department) in Fall, 2004. 1.0 FTE was allocated to CTEM (Construction) for Fall, 2005 and 2.0 FTE's were allocated to CAS (Art) for Fall, 2005. Reductions of FTE will occur by July 1 from the following: LLC 1.0; CHD .25; Student Affairs 1.0;Enrollment Services .64 FTE

Update of Progress Report (June, 2005)

Charge 1: Develop a reallocation model for the colleges and school.

- Attached is a draft document on reallocation principles for unclassified personnel that has been tentatively agreed upon by the deans.
- Also attached is a document listing assumptions of how clerical positions may be allocated among colleges/school.
- Two meetings will be held in June to finalize these models.
- It has been agreed that each college/school, because of differential missions, should not have the same SCH/FTIE. It is generally agreed that CAS should have the highest; CTEM and CHD should be about the same; and SOE should have the lowest because of the professional nature of their mission.
- We are developing a model to reallocate instructional FTE, taking several factors into consideration:
 - Number of undergraduate credits taught
 - Pre-clinical/student teaching/practicum/internship credits (weighted)
 - Graduate credits taught (weighted)
 - Research and scholarship
 - Number of graduates
- We expect to complete this during the summer.

Charge 2: Develop a system to centralize vacant positions to provide for comprehensive review process.

- For each department vacancy, we have used the information provided by BPA along with “profiles” of the departments. This has worked reasonably well.
- For non-instructional positions, the determination has been subjective and units such as the library, enrollment services, and students services have had to reorganize to address the position reductions.

E9

Reallocation Principles

(Draft)

Principles:

1. Consider the outputs – number of graduates from programs.
2. Consider the difference between graduate and undergraduate courses. (*input*)
3. Consider a “fairness” factor in the final decision.
3. Consider research/scholarship productivity.
4. Consider a model that is simple to understand.
5. Consider a model that allows for future reallocation (rebalancing).
6. Consider a model that will allow for the distribution (allocation) if new funds become available.
7. Consider the equitable distribution of non-teaching measures for administrative purposes (program directors, department chairs, classified).
8. Consider the special needs of each college/school for non-instructional/support positions, and the value they add to the operation and institution.
9. Consider the extensive nature of graduate practicums, student teaching supervision, and preclinical experiences.
10. Consider enrollment trends and student credit hour/FTE metrics.
11. Consider resources needed to achieve expected outcomes.

Reallocation principles

Revised 2-21-05

Assumptions for Clerical Reallocation:

E9

1. Each college/school will have 2.00 FTE for the administrative office
 2. Ratio of faculty to clerical = 75% – based on department size
 3. Ratio of program support to clerical = 25% – all programs count the same
-

Model 1:

Total clerical less the 8 allocated to deans' offices; balance split 75% to departments, 25% to programs.

Model 2:

Total clerical split 75% to college/school/departments, 25% to programs; 8.0 allocations to deans' offices subtracted from college/department amount.

Reallocations to date:

-1.00 Assoc dean from Student Services to provost to budget cut (position lost)
+ .25 from CHD to provost to be reallocated
- .45 from provost to Center for Assessment and Continuous Improvement
+ .64 from enrollment services to provost – to be reallocated to instruction
+ .25 from student services to provost – to be reallocated to instruction
- .25 from provost to CHD for rehabilitation and counseling
+ .25 from office of international education to provost for reallocation to instruction

Planned reallocations:

+ .75 from office of international education to provost for reallocation to instruction
+1.00 from LLC to provost for reallocation to instruction
+1.00 from SOE to provost to be reallocated where needed

E9