

HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY  
OFFICE FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

- M E M O R A N D U M -

October 5, 1990

TO: Jack Stoob, Chair, Academic Senate  
FROM: Manuel Esteban, <sup>MAE</sup> Vice President for Academic Affairs  
RE: Criteria and Process for Review of Academic Programs and for  
Structural Reorganization of Colleges

---

This memorandum transmits to the Academic Senate two documents recommended to me by the expanded Academic Resources Allocation Committee. One is entitled "Criteria and Chronology for Identification of Programs for Review". The other is entitled "Process for Structural Reorganization of Colleges."

With regard to the first document you will note that in addition to the criteria and chronology, a table listing programs considered from the standpoint of those criteria is supplied. Column nine in that table identifies all programs that are affected by one or more criteria. Since this is a rather crude way of identifying programs as subject to continued scrutiny, I will ask the committee to continue applying the criteria more holistically in order to identify those programs which will be considered in Stage III of the recommended chronology. It would be premature to ask the Senate's advice regarding the programs listed in the table or indicated in column nine at this time; they are provided as an illustration of how the criteria might be applied. However, I would appreciate any advice the Senate might wish to make concerning the criteria or the chronology which provides for further consultation with the Senate at various stages. I would appreciate receiving a response from the Senate by November 21st. As previously indicated, the committee will be asked to continue its work but our deliberations will be guided by advice which the Senate chooses to give.

With regard to the second document, the "Process for Structural Reorganization of Colleges" I would appreciate the Senate's advice concerning the criteria and the process proposed therein. A date of November 13th is suggested for the Senate's response.

Thank you for your attention.

MAE:WB:pv

cc: Members, expanded ARAC

## STREAMLINING OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The recent planning meetings underlined the necessity for streamlining academic programs in order to better focus available resources upon the core mission of the institution and the core and mandated programs for students. Three assumptions of the planning group are that (1) the campus should follow the general principles of the 1980 campus academic master plan; (2) we shall follow our past practice of not laying off tenured faculty as part of any readjustment (retraining and reassignment of permanent faculty may be necessary for effective use of resources); and (3) faculty shall be incorporated into the consultative process. For decisions at the college level, curriculum committees and/or chairs should be consulted; at the University level the Academic Senate and the University Curriculum Committee should be consulted.

Two further generalizations undergird the decision that streamlining is necessary and desirable. First, if resources continue to be restricted relative to increasing program needs and the campus reaches enrollment limitations as stipulated in the Master Plan, we will be unable to support the continuing enhancement of our academic departments and curricula unless we evaluate and possibly diminish the number of programs, especially those which are resource intensive in terms of faculty or other resources. Second, immediate action is essential since program decisions which include elimination of offerings may require as much as four years for complete implementation.

Two possibilities for streamlining exist. The first would consist of the identification of possible degree programs for reduction, suspension or elimination. The evaluation of these programs would need to be conducted at the University level. The second type of streamlining would occur at the college level and would consist of the elimination of elective offerings: options within majors, minors and special programs; and other reductions and consolidations within programs which are to be retained as undergraduate or graduate majors.

### IDENTIFICATION OF PROGRAMS FOR REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ELIMINATION

One result of the discussion at the Planning Committee meeting was the decision that the Office of Academic Affairs should identify programs for special review with an eye toward elimination of those undergraduate and graduate majors which were not cost effective. It seems clear that the Office of Academic Affairs should not simply wait until each program reaches the time for its usual five year review. Therefore, this report suggests an alternative process in which all programs would be subjected to a preliminary resource review. This review is not intended to take the place of the normal program review process.

A first stage of the preliminary resource review has already been conducted. It used eight (8) criteria to identify programs which should be reviewed further. Those eight criteria were:

1. number of degrees granted during the past three years (less than 10 per year for baccalaureate programs and 5 for masters programs).
2. faculty cost difference (faculty generated minus faculty spent difference of less than 0.0, for both baccalaureate & master levels)

3. student faculty ratio for 1989-90 (a ratio of less than 15)
4. cost per FTES for 1989-90 in terms of expenditures for supplies and services, motor vehicle operation, travel, and equipment (more than \$80 per FTES)
5. 1989-90 FTES operating cost ratio (generated to expended ratio of less than 1.0)
6. total annual operating costs (costs above \$10,000)
7. non-central programs as identified in the 1980 Long Range Planning Document.
8. additional extraordinary costs associated with accreditation; for example, accreditation fees and program subsidies required by accreditation standards.

The programs identified using these eight criteria are listed on pages 4-6. The data used to create the list is presented in the attached table. The list of programs identified by these eight criteria shall be examined in stage two in full session of the Planning Committee. The stage two review will reduce the list and identify those programs for continued review in stage three.

In the third stage each identified program will be invited to present additional information, arguments, and alternatives. This information will be used to formulate a recommendation. A subcommittee of the Academic Resources Allocation Committee (ARAC), plus the Educational Policies Committee Chair and the University Curriculum Committee Chair, will be formed to evaluate the resulting data. Recommendations will be made to the full committee, which will then make recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs who will, in turn, consult with the Academic Senate.

#### STREAMLINING PROGRAMS TO BE RETAINED

We recommend that the Vice President charge the deans in consultation with their curriculum committees to take steps to streamline the academic programs which are not under review by the ARAC by reducing options and elective units wherever beneficial. He should request from the deans a copy of the options/electives reviewed and the decisions which have been made in this area, as of the end of fall semester, with a final report submitted before the end of the academic year. These decisions should be shared with the members of the ARAC to document the efforts that have been made and the results which have been achieved.

Streamlining course offerings which transcend college boundaries should be a responsibility of the Office of Academic Affairs. Issues of real or apparent curriculum redundancy and resource sharing occurring between units could be referred to the respective deans for review/recommendation to the Vice President.

## CHRONOLOGY

### Stage I - All-Program Resource Review

Statistics for each of the eight criteria were compiled and distributed to members of the Planning Committee. The criteria and the resulting list of programs were recommended to the Vice President. The Planning Committee advised the Vice President to submit the criteria and the preliminary list to the Academic Senate for their review and comment.

### Stage II - Reduction of the List by the Planning Committee

The Planning Committee will use the data from Stage One, and will consider each program individually. The criteria will be considered in aggregate to determine if the program should receive further review. The reduced list will be recommended to the Vice President by October 17, 1990. The list may be modified in response to advice regarding the criteria from the Academic Senate.

### Stage III - Program Response

Programs on the list produced by Stage Two will be asked to present information, arguments, and alternatives which might affect the outcome of the deliberations. These written statements will be received by members of ARAC by December 3, 1990. A subcommittee of the ARAC plus the chairs of the Educational Policies Committee and the University Curriculum Committee will consider the reports and make recommendations to ARAC by December 12, 1990. ARAC will submit its final recommendations to the Vice President by December 19, 1990.

### Stage IV - Consultation

Prior to making final decisions, the Vice President consults with the Academic Senate and such other sources of advice as he might designate.

### Stage V - Decision and Dissemination

The Vice President announces the final decisions on programs under review by March 1, 1991. Steps will be taken to ensure wide dissemination of these decisions and the reasons why they were made.

### Stage VI - Dean's Efficiency Evaluations

The college deans submit efficiency evaluations on all continuing programs to the Vice President by April 15, 1991. These evaluations specify the revisions of options, elective courses, and major requirements from academic majors. The evaluations are shared with ARAC and the Academic Senate.

## PROGRAMS PROPOSED FOR FURTHER REVIEW

Based on the criteria earlier identified the following programs are identified.

1. NUMBER OF DEGREES GRANTED DURING THE PAST THREE YEARS (LESS THAN 10 PER YEAR FOR BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS AND 5 FOR MASTERS PROGRAMS) (SSC and options within programs are not listed. B=baccalaureate; M=masters)

Anthropology (B)  
 Art (M)  
 Botany (B)  
 Chemistry (B)  
 Economics (B,M)  
 French (B)  
 German (B)  
 Home Economics (B)  
 Music (B)  
 Oceanography (B)  
 Philosophy (B)  
 Physical Science (B)  
 Physics (B)  
 Range Management (B)  
 Sociology (B)  
 Spanish (B)  
 Speech Pathology and Audiology (B)  
 Zoology (B)

2. FACULTY COST DIFFERENCE (FACULTY GENERATED MINUS FACULTY SPENT DIFFERENCE OF LESS THAN 0.0. FOR BOTH BACCALAUREATE AND MASTER LEVELS)

All graduate programs  
 Anthropology  
 Business Administration  
 Chemistry  
 Computer Information Systems  
 Economics  
 English  
 Ethnic Studies  
 Forestry  
 French  
 Geology  
 German  
 History  
 Home Economics  
 Industrial Technology  
 Journalism  
 Industrial Technology  
 Native American Studies  
 Nursing  
 Political Science  
 Range Management  
 Speech Pathology and Audiology  
 Speech Communications  
 Theatre Arts  
 Watershed  
 Women's Studies

3. STUDENT FACULTY RATIO FOR 1989-90 (A RATIO OF LESS THAN 15)

- Chemistry
- Education
- Environmental Resources Engineering
- Forestry
- Home Economics
- Industrial Technology
- Interdisciplinary Studies
- Linguistics
- Music
- Natural Resources Planning and Interpretation
- Nursing
- Physics
- Range Management
- Speech Pathology and Audiology
- Theatre Arts
- Watershed
- Women's Studies
- Zoology

4. COST PER FTES FOR 1989-90 IN TERMS OF EXPENDITURES FOR SUPPLIES AND SERVICES, MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATION, TRAVEL, AND EQUIPMENT (MORE THAN \$80 PER FTES)

- Art
- Biology
- Chemistry
- Education
- Environmental Resources Engineering
- Geology
- Home Economics
- Industrial Technology
- Journalism
- Music
- Natural Resources
- Natural Resources Planning and Interpretation
- Nursing
- Physical Education
- Physics
- Range Management
- Speech Pathology and Audiology
- Theatre Arts

5. 1989-90 FTES OPERATING COST RATIO (GENERATED TO EXPENDED RATIO OF LESS THAN 1.0)

- Business Administration
- Chemistry
- Environmental Resources Engineering
- Fisheries
- Forestry
- Geology
- Home Economics
- Industrial Technology
- Journalism
- Music
- Natural Resources

- Natural Resources Planning and Interpretation
- Nursing
- Oceanography
- Physics
- Range Management
- Speech Pathology and Audiology
- Watershed

6. TOTAL ANNUAL OPERATING COSTS (COSTS ABOVE \$10,000)

- Art
- Biology
- Chemistry
- Education
- English
- Environmental Resources Engineering
- Foreign Language
- Geology
- Journalism
- Mathematics
- Music
- Natural Resources
- Physical Education
- Physics
- Psychology
- Speech Communication
- Theatre Arts

7. NON-CENTRAL PROGRAMS AS IDENTIFIED IN THE 1980 LONG RANGE PLANNING DOCUMENT

- Computer Information Systems
- Home Economics
- Industrial Technology
- Journalism
- Liberal Studies - Language Studies
  - Child Development
  - Recreation Administration
- Nursing
- Social Work
- Speech Pathology and Audiology

8. ADDITIONAL EXTRAORDINARY COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH ACCREDITATION

- Art
- Chemistry
- Environmental Resources Engineering
- Forestry
- Journalism
- Music
- Nursing
- Theatre Arts