Committee Charge

Develop the initial groundwork for how PSU will conduct its academic program prioritization process or “Program Array Review” not to be confused with “Academic Program Review”

Why do this? Why now?
A portfolio approach that looks at the institution’s performance as a whole
Guide strategic investments in programs that best support institutional goals
Leverage institution-wide data sets to inform resource allocation/reallocation decisions
Thoughtful, careful development of a regularized process; don’t wait for an emergency

Ad Hoc Committee Timeline

Feb 18: Committee formed
Mar 3: Initial presentation to Senate
Apr 7: Final recommendations to Senate
May 5: Steering/Provost present formal charge for working committee(s) to begin the assessment process

Caveat
• We have a basic “architecture” in place
• As a result of our short timeline, there are still many details that will need to be resolved by the next committee

Corollary and Invitation
• It’s not too late for suggestions/other input!

Responses to Charge
Committee Charge

1. Identify and investigate approaches used at other universities (including feedback from participating faculty and administrators)

Lessons Learned

1. Universities develop and implement program prioritization for a range of reasons
2. There is variability in the scope of reviews
3. One size does not fit all

Conclusion

PSU needs a prioritization process that is consistent with our current governance structure, institutional history, and fiscal situation

Guiding principles

1. Clear objectives
2. Transparency and continuous communication
3. Engage faculty
4. Focus on the “big picture”
5. Develop a repeatable process
6. Develop a data-driven process

Committee Charge

1. Identify and investigate approaches used at other universities (including feedback from participating faculty and administrators)

2. Recommend a framework for PSU

Criteria, Metrics, and Categories

1. Program prioritization calls for the use of a set of evaluation criteria that can be applied to all of the programs in the review

2. Programs are assessed with respect to the chosen criteria using a set of quantitative metrics and qualitative questions

3. Programs are grouped into categories rather than attempting a total rank-ordering
Key components

Phase 1: initial parameter setting

Evaluation criteria
Quantitative metrics
Qualitative components
Categories

Key components

Phase 1: initial parameter setting

OIRP

Assignment of programs to categories
Supporting rationale
Program statement/response

Key components

Phase 1: initial parameter setting

Phase 2: data gathering, measurement, and analysis

Phase 3: reflection/recommendation

Recommendations for Faculty Senate and Administration

Committee Charge

1. Identify and investigate approaches used at other universities (including feedback from participating faculty and administrators)

2. Recommend a framework for PSU

3. Determine a timeline and representation on subsequent committee(s)

Timeline

Phase 1: initial parameter setting

One term
(first iteration may require longer)

Phase 2: data gathering, measurement, and analysis

One/two terms

Phase 3: reflection/recommendation

One term (possible overlap with Phase 2)

Communication

Assessment

future iterations of the process
Academic Program Prioritization Committee (APPC)

Phase 1: initial parameter setting
Phase 2: data gathering, measurement, and analysis
Phase 3: reflection/recommendation

- 6-10 members, tenured faculty with leadership experience, trusted members of the PSU community
- Serve, not as representatives of particular units, but as advocates for the faculty and PSU as a whole

Program Scoring Team (PST)

Phase 1: initial parameter setting
Phase 2: data gathering, measurement, and analysis
Phase 3: reflection/recommendation

- As many as 30 members, organized into smaller teams
- Broader faculty representation

Committee Charge

1. Identify and investigate approaches used at other universities (including feedback from participating faculty and administrators)
2. Recommend a framework for PSU
3. Determine a timeline and representation on subsequent committee(s)
4. Provide a definition for what constitutes a program and the scope of the review

Proposed definition of academic program

- An academic program is any collection of activities that consumes resources and either:
  - contributes transcripted courses to a credential (e.g., UNST, Honors); or
  - leads to an academic credential (e.g., Minor, BA, BS, Certificate, Graduate Degree).
- Units are not programs: an academic unit is an organizational entity, such as a department or school, and can house one or more programs

Ad Hoc Committee Timeline

Feb 18: Committee formed
Mar 3: Initial presentation to Senate
Apr 7: Final recommendations to Senate
May 5: Steering/Provost present formal charge for working committee(s) to begin the assessment process
... next steps begin ...

We welcome your comments!
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