

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE

**Resolution on the Temporary Use of Modified Program Review
#01-08/09-EX – August 26, 2008**

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University recommends that the Departmental Program Review process be modified temporarily in accordance with the attached Ad Hoc Committee Report, until the beginning of AY 2010/2011.

RATIONALE: The Program Review Process at HSU has been suspended for a year and a half while the new Program Prioritization was being implemented and while WASC reaccreditation worked through the Capacity and Preparatory Review. At the time of suspension, several departments were in various stages of the process, and others were getting ready to begin. The Program Review Process is complex and burdensome. In response to many aspects of the WASC process, the Program Review process is likely to be revised with the aim of streamlining it and making it more useful for planning purposes.

The current Departmental Reports being prepared as part of Program Prioritization provide some of the same information as the required Program Review self-studies, but do not adequately address all of the Program Review issues.

There is a need either to resume the Program Review Process without modification or to modify it so it can take advantage of work already being done for prioritization.

The Senate Executive Committee members who were available met with representatives of the Provost's Council twice this summer, and corresponded via e-mail, to address these concerns. The attached document is a result of those collaborations.

The purpose of the document is to modify the Program Review process using the Prioritization Process' Departmental Reports as a basis. An additional purpose is to save departments the work of separately preparing a Program Review using the old process.

Page Two of the attached document stipulates what additional materials need to be added to those reports in order for the package to serve as a replacement for the documents required in the current Program Review process. The Departmental Reports, with those additions, would allow the university to resume the Program Review process for those departments scheduled to do their Program Reviews. An assessment of the temporarily modified process may also help in putting together a new process to replace the current Program Review process for AY 2010/2011.

This recommendation provides only for a temporary modification of the Program Review process. In the event that by 2010 either a replacement or an extension has not been approved, the current existing Program Review process will be reinstated.

UNANIMOUSLY PASSED – August 26, 2008
Forwarded as Emergency Item
Approved by President Richmond, September 9, 2008

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to recommend a program review addendum to the prioritization documents for programs currently in the program review process

Background

During the 2007-2008 academic year, the program review process was temporarily suspended due to the work being done on the program prioritization. At the time of the suspension, some programs had completed the first year of the cycle and submitted their program documents, while others were in the first year of the cycle and in the process of drafting their program review documents. When the work of the program prioritization committee was at the point where a timeline for the program prioritization process was established (May 2008), it became clear that programs in the second year of the program review cycle and programs scheduled to enter the program review cycle in the 2008-2009 year would be faced with writing the program review documents and the program prioritization documents essentially simultaneously. This circumstance created a potentially excessive work load for faculty under circumstances where workloads were already being stretched by a variety of other factors. While WASC has accepted the temporary suspension of the program review process for the one year, it is not clear that continuation of the suspension would be viewed favorably. In addition, there was concern that continued suspension of the program review process would result in a back log of programs to be reviewed, creating a workload issue following on the heels of the prioritization process.

Members of the Senate Executive Committee met with Provost Snyder at the end of June to discuss these issues. Two recommendations were made:

1. The members of the meeting recommended that those departments who are currently in the program review cycle but have not yet completed and forwarded their program reviews (due to the timing of suspension or other causes) would provide an addendum to their prioritization documents rather than doing a separate full program review. The contents of the addendum would include information normally contained in a program review but not provided as a part of the prioritization documents. An Ad Hoc committee composed of members of Senate Executive Committee and the Provost's Council, including an equal number of administrators and faculty, would be convened to determine the content of the addendum. The recommendation of the Ad Hoc committee would go to Senate Executive Committee and the Provost's Council for review prior to the beginning of the academic year. This procedure was recommended in an effort to 1) minimize additional work load for the departments, and 2) get information to Departments about what documents would need to be prepared as soon as possible.
2. The members of meeting further recommended that program review dates for all other departments be moved back a year and that the program review process be re-evaluated during that year.

The Ad Hoc Committee

The Ad Hoc committee was formed by putting out a request to the members of the Senate Executive Committee and members of the Provost's Council. Two dates were provided for meetings, July 3 and July 18, 2008. Meetings were chaired by Claire Knox, Vice Chair and acting Chair of the Senate. Participants on July 3 included Ken Ayoob, Jena Burges, Ray Wang, Bernadette Cheyne, Martin Flashman and John Powell. Participants on July 18 included Nancy Hurlbut, Jena Burges, Steve Smith, Tasha Souza, Mark Larson, and Cindy Moyer. Gay Hylton from the Provost's office attended meetings and provided minutes of each as well as document and communication support for the committee.

At the first meeting, the committee worked through a comparison of the program review and prioritization documents, creating a "laundry list" of the items which might need to be included in an addendum. At the second meeting, participants reviewed this list, discussing various aspects of the need and utility of specific types of information and drew up the recommendation which follows.

Proposed streamlined program review documents

The content of the proposed addendum is based on the committee's analysis of the requirements of Program Review and the content of the Prioritization Documents (Program Criteria and Department Report), and our discussion of the need for programs to provide critical information in an efficient manner so as not to create unneeded work for departments caught in the program review process during the prioritization process. While a wider discussion of these components would have been useful, the committee was concerned with providing a recommendation before the beginning of the fall semester to that the effected departments could be notified as soon as possible. Where ever possible, the committee has tried to incorporate documents that already exist as part of department records (e.g. Advising plans, Assessment Plan, Course rotation charts), rather than asking for narrative to address components.

Proposed Addendum

Program Analysis

1. A brief description of the program providing additional relevant information not contained in the prioritization documents (e.g. minors, certificates of study, etc.)
2. A brief description of the organization of the curriculum (Graphic presentation is appropriate) including four year graduation plan(s).
3. If the total number of required units for the program is more than 120, provide an explanation of the need for the additional units
4. Assessment Plan (learning outcomes, timetable, results, plans for changes, etc.)
5. Multiyear chart of course rotations by year
6. A brief description of how the department evaluates student satisfaction and/or elicits and uses student evaluative feedback about the program

Changes since last program review

7. A brief discussion of the ways in which goals stated in the Department Report have been met or not met. Provide evidence for goals met and explain why goals not met were not met.
8. A brief discussion of factors contributing to changes. Make reference to Program Criteria Document.

Future Plans

9. A five (5) year Faculty utilization chart indicating how faculty will cover the curriculum, identifying anticipated Sabbaticals, Difference in Pay leaves and retirements.
10. Brief narrative identifying specific plans, anticipated changes or opportunities or other future circumstances that the department would like to work toward to be positioned to capitalize on.

Appendices

1. Library Resource Analysis
2. Other pertinent data (optional – might included information about accreditation if not included elsewhere)

Approved by the Senate Executive committee, 8/22/08

Approved by the Academic Senate, 8/26/08 – Forwarded as an emergency item to President Richmond

Approved by President Richmond, 9/9/08

Merry Schellinger

From: Rollin Richmond [rollinr@humboldt.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, September 09, 2008 3:41 PM
To: Saeed Mortazavi
Cc: Merry Schellinger; Bob Snyder; Mary Greta
Subject: Items from Senate Meeting of August 26th

Dear Saeed:

I approve resolutions #01-08/08EX and #2-08/09-EX. Thanks for your action on these items. Rollin

Rollin C. Richmond, President
Humboldt State University
Phone: 707-826-3311
Email: rollinr@humboldt.edu
Cell: 707-599-6699

Humboldt State University: Learning to Make a Difference. Visit us on the Web at www.humboldt.edu.