



M E M O R A N D U M

Date: November 4, 2009

To: Academic Senate Executive Committee

From: Integrated Curriculum Committee

Re: Discontinuance of the Applied (Industrial) Technology Program

The Program Prioritization process resulted in a number of programs being placed in Category I, Enhance, and Category IV, Restructure or Eliminate. On 23 March 2009 Interim Provost Snyder released his recommendations regarding the future of all of the programs in Category IV and some of those in Category I. These programs were requested by the temporary Academic Planning Committee (APC) to submit a Report responding to the prioritization categorization and the Provost’s recommendations to the newly formed Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC) by 14 Sept. 2009.

This fall, the ICC assumed responsibility for completing the Post-prioritization process. The committee followed the process outlined by last year’s ad hoc APC (links to pertinent documents can be found at the end of this memo). The ICC’s Academic Master Planning Subcommittee (AMP) was assigned to complete an in-depth review of the program proposals and responses, and make a recommendation to the ICC for programs in Prioritization Category 4 using a university-wide perspective. To accomplish this, the AMP reviewed the recommendations of the prioritization task force, deans, and the provost; program responses to the prioritization report; program proposals requested by the APC and all pertinent documents submitted; and met with a program representative to discuss the proposals and recommendations. The AMP recommendation was then developed and referred to the ICC for discussion.

The AMP/ICC used the following guidelines when formulating the recommendation provided below.

- Begin with the Prioritization Task Force recommendation as the starting point.
- Review Prioritization criteria: alignment with HSU mission and vision, program quality, cost effectiveness, and program demand
- Determine whether the program response provides a compelling case for overriding the recommendations of Prioritization Task Force, Deans, and Provost.

Attachment #1 to Resolution #11-09/10-EX

- Consider the ramifications for other programs of overriding Category 4 recommendations, given the original goal of prioritization to change the campus program mix, combined with the current budget crisis and the need to reduce Academic Affairs' base budget.

In placing the Applied (Industrial) Technology program in Category IV, the Program Prioritization Task Force noted that "Lack of faculty, questionable efficiency factors, and curricular instability suggest that this would be an appropriate program for elimination." In their response, the Department questioned the scores assigned for various areas and pointed to the notable success of the program in increasing enrollments, in spite of minimal resources provided. The Dean's recommendation suggested several potential options for the program, including 1) "loan" Dr. Eric Van Duzer (from Education, but with an IT background) to lead the program to see if it can stabilize, 2) reduce the program to one or two stand-alone minors, or 3) eliminate the program, but maintain the LD GE course IT 104 (Beginning Wood). The Provost recommended elimination of the program, largely because of low ranking and lack of tenure track faculty, and suggested exploring the extent to which parts of the program could be incorporated into other majors.

As directed in a memo sent from the Academic Planning Committee on April 29, 2009, an Applied Technology Ad Hoc Program Committee was formed to respond to the Prioritization Task Force report and the Dean's and Provost's recommendations. The Committee consisted of Saeed Mortazavi, AT chair, Ken Ayoob, AHSS Dean, Scott Burgess, Joanne Burke, Eric Van Duzer, and William Wilkinson. Their recommendation was forwarded to the ICC on 30 August 2009.

The recommendation from the Ad Hoc Committee proposed restructuring the major to have only two options, Product Design and Construction Management, as well as a minor in Product Design. The number of units in the major was reduced, and by sharing some courses in the Product Design pathway with the Art Department the number of unique courses required was reduced.

After due consideration of the proposed restructuring, the AMP did not feel that sufficient evidence was provided that this restructuring would address the concerns of the Prioritization Task Force, including the relatively low number of students involved in the program, the significant resources required, and, especially, the lack of permanent faculty to direct the program. Due to these concerns, the AMP did not find sufficient reason to recommend changing the prioritization ranking, agreeing with earlier recommendations that this program should be discontinued.

A motion to recommend elimination of Applied Technology was defeated in the ICC by a vote of 8-7.

In further discussion, a new recommendation was crafted based upon the proposed Product Design option (replacing the current Industrial Design option) as a stand-alone incarnation of the Applied Technology major. The ICC voted (11 to 6, with one abstention) in favor of the following resolution:

Resolution: Recommendation of the ICC to the Academic Senate for the conditional continuation of the Applied (Industrial) Technology Program

- The ICC recommends that admissions be immediately suspended for all options in Applied Technology EXCEPT for the Industrial Design Pathway.
- The revised curriculum for the Product Design pathway will be submitted to the ICC by January 2010 to undergo the curriculum review process. This will replace the Industrial Design pathway. The program must have the new curriculum approved before proceeding with fall 2011 admissions.
- The Construction Management Option should be suspended, but not eliminated at this time.
- We recommend that all options other than the Industrial Design and Construction Management be eliminated as quickly as possible.
- A full program review of the AT Product Design program is due Spring 2013 to evaluate the viability of the revised program.
- By fall 2013, the ATPD program will minimally meet the following, which will be necessary but not considered sufficient to fully evaluate viability:
 1. Showing growth in majors matching or exceeding the average of HSU programs.
 2. Reaching a SFR greater than the HSU average for all lab-based programs.
- Failure to meet these minimum targets will result in the immediate recommendation for discontinuance of the ATPD program forwarded to the senate.

Links to relevant documents:

Prioritization Process Site

<http://www.humboldt.edu/~aavp/Prioritization.html>

AT Ad Hoc Committee Response - ICC Sharepoint Site

<https://its-sharepoint.humboldt.edu/sites/dold/icc/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?RootFolder=%2fsites%2fdold%2ficc%2fShared%20Documents%2fGeneral%20Resources%2fPost%20Prioritization%20Reports%2fPR%2d019%20Ltr%20to%20APC%20and%20Final%20Proposal%5fIndust%20Tech&FolderCTID=&View=%7b26B6770D%2d06F3%2d4469%2d9473%2dF70C87A38D97%7d>

Appendix: The relevant sections of the Prioritization, Dean's, and Provost's reports (cut and pasted from the documents referenced above):

Prioritization Report:

Industrial Technology. 4

Lack of faculty, questionable efficiency factors, and curricular instability suggest that this would be an appropriate program for elimination.

Dean's Recommendations:

Applied (Industrial) Technology Department

The PTF concluded that "Lack of faculty, questionable efficiency factors, and curricular instability suggest that this would be an appropriate program for elimination." Focusing on the lack of faculty and the instability due to the change of faculty would suggest that elimination is the best pathway; however, the IT Prioritization Report and the department's response in the Prioritization Final report point out a couple of important variables that need to be underscored as well. For one, the program has solid internal demands (i.e. the number of majors in the program doubled in just a couple of years once the students thought the program was going to remain) and external demands (i.e. the data indicate that the graduates from the program get jobs and that these jobs are some of the best paying jobs for HSU graduates). Additionally, the program supports the community partnership and sustainability/green core values of HSU with the "Green Lab," the direction of their curriculum, and the present IT grants.

Based upon the information in the AT Prioritization Document and Response, the PTF Report, and HSU core values such as, "We believe individuals must be environmentally, economically and socially responsible in the quest for viable and sustainable communities," ***I propose that elimination is only one possible outcome and that we should explore at least two other possibilities for the AT Program.***

One possibility is to move AT into Category V and see what can happen under the following situation with no new university investment. "Loan" Dr. Eric Van Duzer who is trained in IT as well as Education from the School of Education for three years to teach in AT and lead the program. Dr. Van Duzer would need to reduce the options in AT and to show that the program can stabilize at about 65 majors or continue to grow with new majors. This would enable the "green niche" and partnerships that have begun and the external grant funding to be put to good use.

An alternative possibility is to reduce AT degree programs to one or two 18 unit stand alone minor(s). The minors to consider would be (a) a manufacturing and operations management minor and/or (b) an industrial design minor.

If neither of the above two alternatives is found to be viable, then the program must limp alone with no permanent faculty or hire two full time, tenure track faculty which is what they had in 07-08. I don't feel

the AT program will be competitive at HSU to receive new faculty, at this time. Dr. Mortazavi, Chair of the School of Business, indicated that he did not agree with continuing the program. I recommend ***that we proceed first with alternative one above, then with alternative two above but if neither of these proves workable, then eliminate the AT Program.*** It makes no

sense to suspend the program instead of eliminating it as the amount of money to start up the labs, etcetera again would be prohibitive.

Under any of these three options, I argue that we maintain the lower division IT General Education Class (IT 104. Beginning Wood). This class offers needed diversity in Area C and I have heard many glowing comments about it. I also argue to keep the upper division GE (IT 308 Socio-Technological Thinking Processes) as long as we have a professor who can teach it and enrolment stays up in this upper division GE course.

Provost's Recommendations:

Industrial Technology: The Task Force recommends eliminating the program. The Dean recommends two other possibilities: either moving a faculty from Education, who trained in IT, to help restructure the program or reducing it to a minor program with two options. Given the ranking of the program, the Dean does not recommend an investment of permanent faculty in the program at this time. Given the faculty needs in many programs prioritized higher than Industrial Technology, I recommend eliminating the degree program and exploring the extent to which parts of the program can reasonably be incorporated into other majors. Without a reasonable timeline for committing permanent faculty to the program, it is not reasonable to continue the program with temporary faculty or faculty whose primary expertise is not in the area. The APC should set up a committee to review this recommendation.