

Institution	Priorities or Principles	Criteria	Rating Scale	Process	Results
Ohio State	Quality programs ????	Overall program quality Centrality to mission Peer comparisons Job placement Time to degree Student diversity Student performance	High quality Strong Good New/In transition Reassess or restructure Disinvest or eliminate	Process committee Review program reports Rated programs on 6 pt. scale Recommendations to administration	29 programs to get new funds 27 programs asked to make specific improvements 29 programs asked to restructure 5 programs to be merged with other areas or eliminated
Arizona	Direct student benefit High mission alignment Critical services	Alignment to mission/strategic themes Productivity/cost Contract & grant activity ROI Access to alternative funds Interdisciplinary activity Critical mass	Academic: Essential, High priority, Lesser mission Centers/Institutes: Consolidate or collaborate Phased withdrawal of support Close – low critical mass	Committee Review of program reports Rating of programs Recommended actions Combined with immediate cuts	Reorganization Consider elimination New models Reduced duplication 6 centers to close 4 centers relocated or merged 5centers targeted for phased withdrawal of support
UNLV	Integrity of academic programs Ability of students to progress to degree Long-term progress to building research			Electronic suggestion box Administrative review	Delay raises Hiring delays/freezes/non-renewals System efficiencies Reduce duplication Delayed infrastructure improvements
University of Florida	Quality of education Protect core mission Pursue strategic goals Consider student needs Exempted library and security from cuts	Quality Mission alignment Student needs served		Program reviews College decisions University decisions	Reduce administration Reduce research support Eliminate degrees/centers Reduce courses offered Restructure or merge programs/departments Reduce faculty/staff Reduce enrollment Reduce/eliminate some services and programs
Iowa State	Protect core mission Meet core needs of students Maintain academic program excellence Protect financial aid Not reduce fuel/utilities			Colleges provide plans Review by administrative committee (3 month time frame)	Layoffs Hiring freezes Reduces administration Program & service elimination Energy management program
Cornell University	Minimize firings Continue sustainability agenda Protect financial aid Maintain pay Increase efficiency Accountability			Workforce Planning Committee in place 45 day university wide review of operational effectiveness, policies and procedures with goal to streamline Rigorous review of findings Community meetings Electronic suggestion box	Hiring pause Some layoffs projected Hold on construction Delay infrastructure projects

Washington State		Centrality Cost effectiveness External demand Internal demand Impact on stakeholders Productivity Quality Size	Growth and Investment Maintenance Reorganization/ consolidation/reduction Phase out	Committee to determine process Program level self-assessments Use of rubrics/framework College/dean level review Administrative discussion and recommendations Faculty senate review Public comment Provost decisions	Course reductions Degree audit Strategic hiring Merging/reorganizing Consolidate Phase out/eliminate programs System/process efficiencies
------------------	--	---	---	--	---

Additional institutions in the news for cuts

University of Wisconsin
 Indiana University
 Stanford
 Yale
 University of Georgia
 University of Memphis
 University of Tennessee
 University of Massachusetts
 University of Maryland
 University of Virginia

Common reactions

Restructuring/merging
 Cuts/elimination
 Hiring freezes/layoffs