

Program Review Summary

Overview of program/dept. review and evaluation for resource allocation at CSUDH (3/22/12 by Jan Gasco, EPC Chair)

Under normal conditions, the following documents regarding program review and discontinuance are relevant (note that full text of relevant documents, numbered 1-8, can be found in Program Review documents):

1) **PM 00-03: CSUDH Assessment, Planning, and Resource Allocation (10/16/03)**

Principles and Assumptions

- Review and assessment of programs and determination of program priorities must guide resource allocation.
- The process must be open, including widespread consultation.
- The process must integrate program review and assessment with planning, budget development, and resource allocation.
- Decision-makers must adhere to a University rather than a divisional perspective in determining recommendations to the President.

Key Bodies in the Process

- University Planning Council (UPC) to "advise the President concerning The University's progress in fulfilling its mission and achieving its goals."
- University Budget Committee (UBC) which reviews assessment, planning, and resource allocation reports from all university divisions and makes "recommendations regarding existing programs that should be supported, existing programs that should not be supported, new programs that should be supported, and resource allocations."
- Program Effectiveness Councils (PECS) to review all divisional programs and make recommendations "concerning programs to be supported or to be reduced or discontinued, new programs to be initiated, priorities and program planning, and resource needs of the division and its programs."

2) **Annual Program Effectiveness Report (PER) (Academic Affairs, Oct. 2007)**

For Academic Degree Programs. Specifies process by which academic degree programs are reviewed and assessed leading to recommendations "concerning programs to be supported or to be reduced or discontinued...."

3) **AAAP011.002 (Academic Affairs Manual), Program Review Panel (May 2007)**

Created PRP to oversee academic program review

4) **Academic Program Review and program Viability at CSUDH, proposed definitions, policies, and procedures (May 2002)** (status unknown, possibly superseded by #2 above)

5) **Academic Senate Resolution EXEC 01-05, Policy and Procedures for Campus Academic Organizational Structure (passed 4/18/2001, but never became policy)**

Identified policy and procedures for Establishing, Disestablishing, Reconfiguring, or Renaming Departments or other administrative units that support academic instructional Programs. Included in this document are "Procedures for Discontinuing Academic Units" and instructions for developing a "discontinuation brief" that addressed factors that justified the discontinuance of an academic unit "if it is determined that the continuation of that unit impairs, diminishes, or creates dysfunction for the organizational structure and the instructional mission of the University."

In the Fall of 2009, as a result of a looming budget crisis, a new process for program discontinuance was created.

In Sept., 2009, Academic Affairs released a document entitled **6) [Academic Affairs Fall 2009 Program Planning Process](#)** whose purpose was, "To establish a process to be used for determining which programs will be continued and those that will be eliminated at CSUDH." Department chairs, in consultation with their faculty, were charged with developing and ranking criteria that would be used to identify academic programs and departments to be eliminated. These criteria were to be based upon "the strategic planning framework, and accompanying materials (program review documents, yearly reports, program costs, graduation rates, retention information, etc.)." These criteria were then to be applied by Deans and the Provost to determine which programs/depts. would be eliminated. The document listed specific steps and dates in this process. The process led to the creation of the following criteria:

Tier I Criteria

- Impact, Justification, and Overall Essentiality of the Program
- Quality of Program Inputs and Processes
- Quality of Program Outcomes

Tier II Criteria

- External Demand for the Program
- Internal Demand for the Program

Tier III Criteria

- Size and Scope of the Program
- Revenue and Other Resources Generated by Program
- Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program

Departments and programs were to file reports to respond to the criteria by documenting relevant information about their programs (remains unclear just how many programs did this).

This process led to the production of **7) [Academic Program Criteria and Dollars Savings](#)** document.

On December 2, 2009, the results of the Program Planning Process were reported to the campus community in a memo **8)**, and Academic Affairs was able to meet the budget deficits without eliminating academic departments or programs. **[Budget Memo.](#)**

In Spring 2012, the university is again facing the possibility that budget cuts, whose exact numbers are still unknown, may again trigger a decision to consider department or program elimination.

A review of all documents listed above reveals broad similarities across all of the documents in terms of what features of a program should be evaluated. Only the 2009 process, however, ranked the criteria. Virtually all of the criteria by which programs are evaluated through the normal Program Review process are present in the 2009 Program Planning Process.

Note: Two additional documents should be noted. Exec 09-05, "Criteria and Policy for Temporary Suspension of Programs" was a Senate resolution passed in May, 2009, due to an erroneous conclusion that it conflicted with Exec 01-05 (which was never turned into policy, either). Additionally,

FPC 10-10, "Policy on discontinuance of Academic Degree Programs," was developed during 09-10, but was never placed on a Senate agenda.