ECU must engage in innovative and unique changes to optimize revenue generated by faculty efforts. However, focusing singularly on FTE production could lead to decisions that are detrimental to the broader institution. A complete fiscal picture, utilizing multiple performance measures and an associated revenue distribution model is required. Nonetheless, increasing funding through FTE production is critical to the institution’s future and replenishing faculty numbers.

1. Development of new programs must carefully consider the UNC Funding Formula and the corresponding CIP codes assigned to the program’s courses. Additionally, a rigorous and transparent process for tracking fulfillment of the enrollment projections of a given program should be developed and implemented.

2. Leverage online offerings to increase FTE generation by (1) ensuring general education (GE) requirements can be completed online and (2) expand offering of online bachelor’s degree programs.

3. Reconstruct General Education (GE) requirements to be in congruence with SACSCOC requirements.

4. Redevelop core program courses to reside in the unit that holds the degree program.

5. Explore the reassignment of qualified and willing faculty currently supporting undergraduate programs with predominately Category I courses to units in support of programs with predominately Category II, III, and IV courses.

6. Charge EPPC to evaluate and make recommendations for reviewing and managing low enrollment degree and certificate programs.

7. Develop a process internal to ECU for continual financial evaluation of master’s and doctoral programs.

8. Revise ECU PRR REG02.07.06 on faculty workloads to provide greater clarity and alignment with other workload regulations set forth by UNC-SO.

9. Evaluate how units across the ECU campus can be consolidated to eliminate redundant programs and activities with FTE gains being reinvested into master’s and doctoral programs.
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1. MEMBERSHIP

Mark Bowler, Department of Psychology
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Paul Schwager, Dean of the College of Business
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2. CHARGE

The Fiscal Sustainability Coordinating Committee Enrollment subgroup was tasked with making recommendations for maximizing revenue from academic programs – both existing and future programs while maintaining appropriate balance between teaching, service, and research/scholarship.

3. ACTIONS

The Fiscal Sustainability Coordinating Committee Enrollment subgroup reviewed the following materials:

- UNC Semester Credit Hour Enrollment Change Funding Model
- ECU Academic Program Inventory
- ECU Faculty Manual Part VI and Part VIII
- ECU PRR REG 02-07-06
- UNC-SO Policy Manual Sections 400-3-1-1 and 400-3-4
- UNC 2020 Faculty Teaching Workload Report
- ECU 2014 University Committee on Fiscal Sustainability Recommendations
- ECU Low Productivity Policies and Procedures
- SACSCOC 2020 Resource Manual for The Principles of Accreditation
- ECU General Education requirements
- Data from the University of Delaware Study of Instructional Costs
- The past five years of ECU data regarding:
  - enrollment by unit and major;
  - degrees conferred by unit and major;
  - students, faculty, and staff counts by department;
  - undergraduate and master’s course section enrollment;
  - under-enrolled lecture sections;
  - productivity matrix.

BACKGROUND

Based on the charge that was given to the committee, the focus of this subcommittee report is on fiscal sustainability, program funding, and faculty productivity. Subsequently, the language of the report is relative to that focus. Consequently, the use of terms such as “value” are fiscal in nature and not a comment on the social or educational worth of any program. Assessments of that nature were deemed to be well beyond the scope of this subcommittee report.
The primary source of funding for East Carolina University (ECU) comes from the State of North Carolina. The Semester Credit Hour Enrollment Change Funding Model is the means by which the amount of money that is provided to the university is ascertained. It should be noted that this model applies to the funding of the fall and spring semesters as well as summer distance education – both not other summer offerings. Additionally, this model does not apply to the funding of the Brody School of Medicine or the School of Dental Medicine. The model has three primary components. The first component is a count of student credit hours (SCHs). This count is partitioned into three instructional levels (undergraduate, master’s, doctoral) and four instructional categories (I, II, III, IV).

**Instructional level** is indicated by the number associated with any given course and not the student taking the course. For example, an undergraduate student enrolled in a master’s course will generate master’s-level SCHs. Additionally, it should be noted that undergraduate SCHs are not partitioned into upper and lower divisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Instructional Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1000 through 4999</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 through 7001</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7002 through 9001</td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Remedial courses are not reimbursed via the funding model.

**Instructional category** has been predetermined by the UNC system and utilizes the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) developed by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Each educational discipline falls within a specific CIP code, and the UNC system has put each CIP code within a specific category. Thus, each degree offered by the university has a corresponding CIP code that indicates its discipline and place within the UNC funding model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Category</th>
<th>CIP</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>Communications &amp; Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Philosophy &amp; Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Corrections &amp; Criminal Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>Area, Ethnic, Cultural &amp; Gender Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Education*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Foreign Languages, Literatures, &amp; Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Family &amp; Consumer Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences, Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Multi/Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Parks, Recreation, Leisure &amp; Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Business, Management, &amp; Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Natural Resources &amp; Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. *Based on Board of Governors’ action, student credit hours for student teaching in Education are placed in Category III for all campuses.

Instructional level and instructional category are combined to create a 4x3 matrix that represents the source of all of the institutions’ SCHs for a given year.

### Funding Model Component 1: Example Student Credit Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Category</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>6030</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>2118</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Data in this table is the example data included in the UNC Semester Credit Hour Enrollment Change Funding Model User Manual.*

The second component of the funding model is the **instructional position factors**. These are the number of SCHs that are necessary for a single **full-time equivalent (FTE)** faculty position. An FTE is a standardized representation that proportionately converts full-time and part-time academic loads into a single full-time equivalent represented as “1.” There are unique institutional position factors for each of the cells of the 4x3 matrix.

### Funding Model Component 2: Instructional Position Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Category</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>708.64</td>
<td>169.52</td>
<td>115.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>535.74</td>
<td>303.93</td>
<td>110.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>406.24</td>
<td>186.23</td>
<td>109.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>232.25</td>
<td>90.17</td>
<td>80.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total SCHs are divided by the instructional position factors to generate the **instructional positions required**. Instructional positions required are represented as FTEs. All of the instructional positions required are summed for a total number of positions requested by the university.
Subsequently, for the example data presented above, 29.20 FTEs are required. The number of required FTEs is then multiplied by the *instructional salary rate of campus*, which varies across UNC institutions and is a function of current salaries at a particular institution. Additional funding based on proportions of this value are provided for “other” academic costs, library expenditures, and general institutional support. The final summed amount – less the expected tuition generated – is the primary source of funding that is provided to the institution for paying faculty salaries. Thus, increasing FTE generation provides the university with additional funding for more faculty hires.

### GENERAL ANALYSES AND OBSERVATIONS

The primary variable in the Semester Credit Hour Enrollment Change Funding Model is the number of SCHs that are generated by the institution. Other values in the model are generally constant. Subsequently, the continuing focus has always been on general enrollment growth. However, uniform growth is potentially problematic as it will only maintain the status quo (i.e., the ratio of students to faculty will remain the same). Enrollment growth should be guided in such a way that it only occurs in areas that maximize FTE generation. For example, 10 undergraduates completing 30 SCHs a year of Category I courses would generate .42 FTE. In contrast, it would only require 7.6 students completing 30 SCHs a year of Category II undergraduate courses to generate the same amount of FTE, with the same number of SCHs in Category III undergraduate courses only requiring 5.7 students, and Category IV undergraduate courses only requiring 3.3 students.

- Undergraduate Category I programs require the most SCHs (708.64) to generate a single FTE. In contrast, Category II is 1.3x more effective at generating FTEs than Category I, Category III is 1.7x more effective than Category I, and Category IV is 3.3x more effective. It should be noted that there is a positive association between a faculty member’s salary and the category of the program the faculty member serves. However, differences in FTE generation due to different category valuations in the funding model negate this association such that there is no clear association between funding category and department-level salary costs for FTE generation.

- Master’s Category I is potentially the single best institutional investment as it requires only 169.52 SCHs for a single FTE. Although Category IV master’s programs and all categories of doctoral student education are more valuable in the funding model, graduate students in this category are more likely to pay tuition and less likely to expect an assistantship, with the programs themselves requiring comparatively fewer facilities and specialized equipment.

- Doctoral level instruction is almost indistinguishable across categories with a small advantage toward Category IV. Assuming similar demand for assistantships and tuition waivers from students in those programs, the largest cost variation would come from idiosyncratic program requirements (e.g., facilities, equipment, support staff). Return on investment for those programs must include these types of factors in its calculations.
• There is an intra-institutional competitiveness regarding FTE generation at both the department and college levels. Specifically, as FTE generation is used as a performance metric, it is often in the best interest of departments and colleges to make decisions that are good for their FTE generation but bad for the overall FTE generation of the institution.
• Despite being a public institution, numerous decisions regarding academic programs, faculty workload, and the allocation of new faculty lines are made without any transparency or accountability.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Many of the following recommendations represent potential adjustments that are outside of ECU’s typical tolerance for risk and change. ECU cannot simply mimic the changes of other institutions. At best, this puts us in a place where we are simply catching up to our peers. Thus, we must engage in innovative and unique changes. Two means for achieving this is (1) optimizing our academic programming to fit the UNC funding model and (2) ensuring that faculty workloads are optimized. However, we are not advocating that ECU should singularly focus on FTE production as a performance metric for departments, schools, and colleges. Although locally beneficial, this could lead to decisions that are detrimental to the broader institution. A complete fiscal picture, utilizing multiple performance measures and an associated revenue distribution model, would enable solutions that span units and colleges and maximize revenues for all stakeholders. Nonetheless, increasing FTE production, and the funding that comes from it, is critical to the institution’s future and helping to replenish our faculty numbers.

Recommendation 1: Faculty developing new programs must carefully consider the UNC Funding Formula and the corresponding CIP codes assigned to the program’s courses. Additionally, we must establish a more rigorous and transparent process for tracking fulfillment of the enrollment projections of a given program.

When developing new programs, faculty and administration should consider the differential funding that is provided based on the associated CIP code of the program’s courses and their categorization within the UNC Funding Model. This information should be added to documents and applications used within ECU’s internal approval process for new programs (e.g., Curriculog forms). Additionally, program development includes projections of student enrollment and faculty costs. These projections should be differentially evaluated based on their place within the funding model (i.e., a projection of 50 undergraduate students enrolled in Category I courses is fundamentally different than a projection of 50 undergraduate students enrolled in Category III courses). Moreover, transparent evaluations of these projections must be made to ensure that the University is appropriately utilizing its limited resources. Lastly, a sunset policy should be developed with a sunset clause included in all new program proposals.

Recommendation 2: Leverage online offerings to increase FTE generation by (1) ensuring general education (GE) requirements can be completed online, and (2) expand offering of online bachelor’s degree programs.

Currently, all of ECU’s limited number of online undergraduate programs are restricted to degree-completion programs. More specifically, that means that all of the online undergraduate degrees offered by ECU require students to have completed the first two years of courses at a community college or other institution. Although this is beneficial to those who have completed that requirement, it is an erroneous and dismissive expectation that all potential students will complete their initial
coursework in this manner (e.g., many part-way-home students do not meet this requirement; many
transfer students do not meet this requirement). Thus, although online bachelor’s degrees are available,
not having all of the ancillary degree components associated with GE is detrimental to the overall
enrollment in these programs. To facilitate greater growth in online education, ECU should determine
feasibility of making GE coursework available to both on-campus students and in a fully online format.
Additionally, ECU’s offering of online undergraduate programs is limited to a few specific areas. With the
massive redeployment of courses to an online format due to the pandemic, it is apparent that numerous
degrees could possibly be completed online without substantial difficulties. Careful consideration should
be taken when making these assessments – many programs cannot be offered online. However,
strategic growth of online instruction allows for increased opportunity for numerous non-traditional
groups such as current activity duty military, military veterans, part-way-home students, and students
with disabilities. It is worth noting that not all programs and units have the necessary technology and/or
support to easily transition face-to-face classes into the online format. Therefore, programs that
currently already have an established mechanism and have the necessary technical support for online
instruction might serve as the starting place for expanding online education to a greater extent. As there
is an increasing national demand for quality online education, the institution should leverage this
opportunity to grow enrollments via the deployment of additional online undergraduate and graduate
programs.

**Recommendation 3**: Reconstructing General Education (GE) requirements to be in congruence with
SACSCOC requirements.

As noted by SACSCOC:

The institution requires the successful completion of a general education component at the
undergraduate level that: (a) is based on a coherent rationale; (b) is a substantial component of
each undergraduate degree program. For degree completion in associate programs, the
component constitutes a minimum of 15 semester hours or the equivalent; for the
baccalaureate programs, a minimum of 30 semester hours or the equivalent. (c) ensures
breadth of knowledge.

Currently, ECU has more than 700 courses that qualify for GE credit, which makes it difficult to clearly
understand the “coherent rationale” of the program. Moreover, ECU currently requires 40 credit hours
of GE courses – 10 more than the SACSCOC requirement. With the recent UNC-SO mandated reduction
to 120 hours, many programs no longer allow students any electives within their curriculum. ECU should
reconstruct the current GE requirements to clarify the reasoning for the specific GE choices while also
providing students with more flexibility via a reduction of the 40-hour requirement. Moreover, required
courses that do not fulfill the SACSCOC GE requirements but are nonetheless required by the university
should not be identified as GE courses, and further consideration should also be given to degrees that
require specific GE courses, as this is often punitive to students who change majors. Overall, the
additional flexibility will be beneficial to transfer students, non-traditional students, and further assist
on-time graduation while also solidifying the importance of GE to all of our undergraduate students.

**Recommendation 4**: Redevelop core program courses to reside in the unit that holds the degree
program.

There are numerous degree programs that utilize courses from other disciplines as part of their core
degree requirements. This causes problems with scheduling which in turn interferes with on-time
degree completion. More importantly, it devalues the program in terms of the UNC Funding Model (i.e., SCHs that are generated by Category I courses that are part of Category II, III, and IV programs are funded at the Category I value). Wherever possible, the core courses within a degree program should reflect the funding category of that degree. This issue is persistent throughout the undergraduate catalog. For example, most undergraduate degrees in the ECU College of Business require a course that covers business ethics. Currently, this requirement is satisfied via PHIL 2274 (Business Ethics). In contrast, undergraduate degrees in the UNC-CH College of Business fulfill this requirement via BUSI 404. Thus, UNC-CH is funded at a higher level for a course that is covering the same material and fulfilling the same requirement.

Across the institution, these kinds of structural corrections would have a substantial positive impact on the SCH generation that comes from the UNC Funding Model. Implications for faculty credentialling, particularly with accreditation bodies, should be carefully explored before consideration of these types of changes. That said, faculty who are currently qualified to teach the lower category version of the course would almost surely be qualified to teach the revised version of the course as credentialling is a function of the faculty member and the course being taught, not the congruence between the faculty member and the department or college that holds the program.

**Recommendation 5:** Explore the reassignment of qualified and willing faculty currently supporting undergraduate programs with predominately Category I courses to units in support of programs with predominately Category II, III, and IV courses.

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) requires faculty to be qualified to teach courses within a particular discipline. This is typically ascertained via degree congruence with a program or department (e.g., a faculty member with a PhD in Economics is qualified to teach courses in economics). However, in some cases, academic programs have courses that draw expertise from other fields (e.g., technical writing courses in engineering draw expertise from English). In these cases, the university is required to demonstrate the specific qualifications of the faculty teaching those specific courses. Given the nature of the UNC Funding Model, it is advantageous to the university to have faculty teaching courses in higher category programs. Given the depletion of faculty across units at the university, there is an opportunity to fill some faculty vacancies in higher-level categories with current qualified personnel. An additional potential issue to consider would be joint appointments and greater flexibility in allowing faculty to teach courses outside of their department. The reassignment of qualified and willing faculty does not apply to all programs and may only involve a few programs that have overlapping areas of specialization. It is possible that this recommendation may be more pertinent when considering where to assign new faculty lines when appropriated to a particular college or division. That is, assigning the line to departments where the associated FTEs with that line can produce the greater financial return. Lastly, careful consideration should be given to the SACS requirements for accreditation, impact on the faculty’s salary and adjustments related to a reassignment for equity, and impact on faculty morale.

**Recommendation 6:** Charge EPPC to evaluate and make recommendations for reviewing and managing low enrollment degree programs. It is recommended that the EPPC establish an internal process for reviewing and managing low enrollment certificate programs as there is no UNC-SO process for this issue.

The UNC-SO has specific requirements for the graduation rates of degree programs. These are apt to change but currently are as follows:
• Undergraduate programs must have a minimum of 35 graduates over 5 years (7 per year).
• Master’s programs must have a minimum of 35 graduates over 5 years (7 per year).
• Doctoral professional programs must have a minimum of 40 graduates over 5 years (8 per year).
• Doctoral research programs must have a minimum of 10 graduates over 5 years (2 per year).

Every two years, programs that are not meeting these requirements are identified by UNC-SO which in turn contacts the university. Via the current process, these programs are allowed to choose between five options: (1) retain the program in its current state with justification, (2) retain the program with steps to increase enrollment, (3) restructure the program by combining it with other programs, (4) discontinue the program, or (5) UNC Language Exchange exemption. This process is currently overseen by ECU’s Academic Planning and Accreditation (APA). As academic programs are the purview of the faculty and not staff or administration, this process should be overseen by a Senate committee supported by APA. Moreover, as program faculty are naturally reluctant to make difficult decisions regarding their own program, this committee should be charged with recommending the final course of action to the Senate and should also be charged with monitoring any changes proposed by the program. Additionally, the committee should be proactive and examine all program data yearly, engaging programs that begin to approach the UNC-SO graduation thresholds (e.g., proactively engage undergraduate and master’s programs with less than 45 graduates over 5 years and encourage them to take steps to improve enrollment). At times, the UNC-SO has changed the minimum number of graduates required. Having a consistent internal process at ECU and having an internal committee for oversight of such program requirements will create a mechanism for tracking factors beyond just graduation rates (e.g., enrollments, growth trends, retention) and provide programs with clearer guidelines and expectations. Ultimately, it will also provide the necessary transparency and accountability to recommendations and actions taken by the programs. It should also be noted that there is currently no UNC-SO process for dealing with low enrollment certificate programs and there are many programs on campus that continue to have low enrollments with no oversight. Although some certificate programs appear to operate without consuming additional resources (e.g., the courses would be offered as such even without the certificate being available), there are numerous hidden labor costs associated that need to be considered. Additionally, in some certificate programs, additional courses are offered because they are needed for the certificate program but are not a part of the degree programs. Thus, the parameters and processes for dealing with low enrollment certificate programs must be developed. This responsibility should also fall to the same committee.

**Recommendation 7:** Develop a process internal to ECU for continual financial evaluation of master’s and doctoral programs.

This process should be decided upon by faculty and administration at ECU and will not necessarily align with the productivity review conducted biannually by the UNC System Office nor is this process intended to be associated with Academic Program Review. It is intended to be an annual review of the financial costs associated with graduate instruction. More specifically, master’s and doctoral programs should be evaluated to determine the financial viability via their inputs (i.e., faculty salaries, student assistantships, tuition waivers, proportional facility and staff costs) and their outputs (e.g., extramural funding, generation of clinical fees, FTE generation). Additionally, doctoral programs that utilize faculty who do not contribute to terminal master’s-level education, particularly those with master’s-level education nested within their curriculum, should consider how to deploy congruent terminal master’s-level educational programs to help offset the costs of their doctoral training via master’s student tuition and
additional SCH growth. Moreover, the development of new doctoral programs should, whenever possible, include terminal master’s-level programming.

**Recommendation 8:** Revision of ECU PRR REG02.07.06 on faculty workloads to provide greater clarity and alignment with other workload regulations set forth by UNC-SO.

This PRR governs faculty workload at ECU. First and foremost, the language that is utilized is unclear and somewhat incongruent with the language that is used in the corresponding sections of the UNC-SO Policy Manual (e.g., the terms “teaching load” and “instructional load” have different meanings in the UNC-SO Policy Manual but are used interchangeably in the ECU PRR). This leads to substantial confusion about what is and is not expected regarding faculty teaching loads. Additionally, the guidance regarding the policies and procedures for the assignment of course releases is vague and lacking both accountability and transparency. Subsequently, revisions to this PRR should address considerations for FTE impact, require public disclosure to unit faculty of all teaching assignments and the rationale for all awarded course releases, and provide caps to the number of releases that can be provided to faculty if not supported by extramural funding. More importantly, despite increased workloads being common practice at ECU, there is no guidance in this PRR for increasing faculty workload above the UNC-SO assignment of 5 3-semester hour organized classes nor is there guidance regarding the impact of increased workload on faculty annual evaluations (e.g., some faculty are punished for a lack of research productivity with an increased teaching load; however, they are still evaluated via the same research rubric despite being assigned activities that are detrimental to their research productivity). Additionally, this PRR does not address the policies associated with the teaching loads of faculty on fixed-term contracts.

**Recommendation 9:** Evaluate how units across the ECU campus can be consolidated to eliminate redundant programs and activities with FTE gains being reinvested into master’s and doctoral programs.

There are numerous academic programs at ECU with substantial overlap in their program content. Bringing these similar programs together in the same unit would produce increased efficiencies in educational delivery. For example, quantitative training in similar disciplines at both the undergraduate and graduate levels could be combined. Additionally, this type of unit consolidation would provide the potential for the development of new multidisciplinary undergraduate programs with courses categorized at a higher funding level (i.e., the new 2020 CIP codes include numerous new multidisciplinary fields representing modern integrations of traditional disciplines). Furthermore, as the contribution of each specific discipline to the new multidisciplinary undergraduate program would be broader, hiring into the new unit could be focused on the needs of higher funded graduate programs and not idiosyncratic discipline demands of the former undergraduate programs. Lastly, these types of consolidations would generate a reduction in part-time administrative appointments (i.e., fewer department chairs) and staff could be reallocated to other departments/units. Units that might be explored as part of this recommendation would include those with the same accreditation organization, the same or similar CIP codes, similar quantitative methodologies, or have low enrollments.