Academic Portfolio Review and Integration Process Oversight Committee
Identified Areas for UMS Action, January 2015

At its December 2014 meeting, the APRIP Oversight Committee identified five areas for UMS action to facilitate success in the APRIP effort. These are:

1. **Future State.** Provide a clear framework for the UMS (structurally, financially) that will maintain campus-level distinctions and identities while safeguarding collaboration. This is the scaffold within which APRIP sub-teams will deliberate and make recommendations on the futures of disciplines in the UMS. Knowing whether the UMS will be, for example, a unified university, seven entrepreneurial and largely independent universities, or something in-between, e.g., several networked universities, will advance the work of discipline-specific sub-teams.

2. **Incentives.** Provide positive incentives for desired behavior and eliminate perverse incentives that propagate undesired behaviors. In particular:
   
   a. **Invest funds in inter-university collaborations.** Provide seed money for inter-university initiatives with high potential to improve program quality, broaden access, and realize financial savings.
   
   b. **Rethink policies that thwart inter-university collaborations.** Current policy and practice tend to promote inter-university competition over collaboration. A prime example is the formula for Outcomes-Based Funding, which allocates funds to campuses based on the number of degrees granted.

3. **Budgeting/Enrollment Accounting Reform.** Corollary to item 2, address implications of UMS budget and enrollment accounting practices, which may jeopardize academic portfolio integration. That each campus must balance its budget and because most campus revenues come from credit hour generation means that campuses have a powerful incentive to hoard credit hours. Current practices complicate inter-campus registration and distribution of tuition dollars. They also hamper student success, as when inter-campus students cannot make a Dean’s List for lack of sufficient credits at a single campus.

4. **Technology Disparities.** Invest to normalize the quality of technology infrastructure to support inter-university programs. To facilitate innovation in distance education, develop an inventory of technology disparities and an investment plan to address them.

5. **Data Consistency.** Create standard operating procedures—potentially through a Data Czar—to harmonize and integrate UMS data systems and tools. Cross-university reporting, as formulated by campus-based institutional researchers, is hampered by incompatible data, language, parameters, and inputs. A particular impediment to APRIP success is the functioning of Maine Street, the channel for data collection, analysis, and action, which operates separately for each of the seven UMS universities.