

TO REPLACE Item E7

Revised Motion on the Academic Program Prioritization process

Historical Background

Provost Andrews introduced the prospect of an academic prioritization process to the Senate Steering Committee in October, 2013, and initially presented the idea to Senate in November, 2013. The idea of academic program prioritization was discussed by the Senate in a committee of the whole in January, 2014. During the committee of the whole, a straw poll was taken wherein the majority of members voted in favor of a faculty-led ad hoc committee to explore and report on how the process might be done at PSU.

The first Ad Hoc committee presented its findings to the Faculty Senate in April, 2013. At its June 2, 2014 meeting Senate approved the creation of an ad hoc Academic Program Prioritization Committee (APPC). In June 2014, a slate of seven faculty members for APPC were recommended by Senate Steering and the Advisory Council and approved by the President. The committee began its work in summer 2014. Since then, it has done two campus wide forums, several faculty senate updates, and numerous presentations in departments, schools, and colleges to solicit input from the campus community.

The initial APPC charge instructed the committee to present its final report in June 2015. Based on feedback from faculty forums and the strong desire expressed by faculty to have the work of creating reports and scoring done during the regular academic year, the committee has requested more time to finish its work and requested clarity for its charge from Senate. The motions below were written jointly by members of the Steering Committee and the Ad Hoc APPC.

Whereas: Our purpose is to provide a faculty voice in planning for a future that aligns with PSU's academic priorities,

Whereas: We want to ensure shared governance in the academic prioritization process,

Motion 1:

Faculty Senate endorses the continuation of the work of the Ad Hoc Academic Program Prioritization Committee, per the charge of June 2, 2014. APPC will make an interim report to Senate on October 5, 2015 to solicit feedback on the results of its pilot test of the scoring rubrics. Senate expects to receive the final APPC report in winter term, 2016.

Rationale:

Faculty Senate is endorsing continuation because we believe the process is important. The Academic Program Prioritization Committee. APPC has gathered broad faculty input and has pledged to continue to seek faculty input about the process at every step along the way of the process. An iterative process such as this takes longer than a top down approach. The APPC is

committed to incorporating appropriate feedback and engagement with faculty and to delivering these results its final report in a timely manner.

Motion 2

Faculty Senate approves the 5 criteria adopted for the APPC review: (1) Relation to Mission, (2) Demand/Trajectory, (3) Quality, (4) Productivity, (5) Financial Performance, with indicators for each criterion to be piloted before implementation.

Rationale:

Faculty Senate is endorsing the use of these the 5 criteria, based on the work of the Ad Hoc APPC and feedback from faculty at campus forums and smaller meetings. The process that yielded these 5 criteria aimed to find a balance between key academic priorities of PSU and the pragmatic needs of gathering reliable and comparable information. In addition, the measures for the criteria are designed to match available quantitative data with additional qualitative reports by programs that provide context for understanding their activity. The committee has endorsed a process whereby these criteria will be scored holistically based on a combination of data provided by OIRP and qualitative information provided by programs, requiring, if needed, minimal data collection by program heads.

Background:

The preliminary indicators that the committee has developed for each category are in Table 1 below. These indicators focus on areas that faculty have most responsibility for: academic quality and student learning while attending to the realities of demand and cost. Specific rubrics to evaluate these measures are under development by the committee, and will be piloted ahead of the October 5, 2015 Senate meeting and refined before being applied to the full set of programs at PSU.

Table 1: Criteria for APP with draft indicators

Relation to Mission	
OIRP will provide data for:	Program will provide narrative for the program and its concentrations on:
	<i>Narrative discussing how program supports mission and priorities of school or college, and university mission and priorities</i>
Quality	
OIRP will provide data for:	Program will provide narrative for the program and its concentrations on:
<i>Number of credits required for the program</i>	<i>Putting OIRP data into context</i>
<i>a) Number required from within the program</i>	<i>Coherence of credits for the program</i>
<i>b) Number required from outside the program</i>	<i>Program's investment in and process for advising</i>
<i>Faculty demographics and highest degree</i>	<i>Program's measures for ensuring educational quality</i>

*Range of class sizes for lecture or seminar courses
Demographics of majors and degree recipients*

Program's assessment of student learning

Demand/Trajectory

OIRP will provide data for:

*Trends in majors
Non-majors taking courses in program
Number of degrees by program
Program degrees as percentage of total
department degrees awarded*

**Program will provide narrative for the program
and its concentrations on:**

*Putting OIRP data into context
Program's connections to other programs
Future directions for program*

Productivity

OIRP will provide data for:

*Graduation rates, by major
Program degrees/certificates awarded
Time to degree, by program
Number of credits accumulated at graduation

SCH per faculty FTE
Sponsored research expenditures*

**Program will provide narrative for the program
and its concentrations on:**

*Putting OIRP data into context
Faculty scholarly/creative activity
Faculty community engagement
Student involvement in scholarly/creative activity
and/or community engagement*

Financial Performance*

OIRP will provide data for:

*Revenue and expenditures summary
Faculty by full-time/part-time and tenure status*

**Program will provide narrative for the program
and its concentrations on:**

Putting OIRP data into context

*The University Budget Office is working to determine whether additional data could be provided that might be useful indicators for APP.