

Chapter Three

Achieving Our Core Institutional Purpose by

Realigning Resources and Institutional Structures

The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through its investment in human, physical, fiscal, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high quality environment for learning.

WASC Standard Three

Most institutions can no longer afford to be what they've become.

- Robert C. Dickeson,
Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services

Realignment of resources and institutional structures at Humboldt State University is beginning to follow a model of *adaptive management*, in which well-defined objectives are optimized adaptively, not through trial-and-error (“managing adaptively”) but rather through a systematic process of purposeful data collection and analysis that informs decision-making. Adaptive management requires data upon which decisions will be based and well-defined mechanisms for analyzing and using that data.

Based on input from WASC following the CPR visit, and from other external reviews (see Chapter Four), it was apparent that HSU needed to improve both data quantity/quality and decision-making mechanisms. Although the ultimate goal of institutional resource and structure realignment is to create an adaptive management process that will serve us into the future, the immediate need for data required the University to undertake a far-reaching assessment of the current state of its programs, departments and services. This assessment took the form of a prioritization process, in which programs, departments and services were not only assessed but were compared to each other in order to identify relative strengths and weaknesses across the entire institution and thereby inform decisions regarding resource realignment and reorganization of institutional structures. The prioritization process required substantial expenditure of time on the part of faculty, staff and administration, but it was designed to be a one-time data collection and analysis effort that would jump-start the adaptive management process.

Concurrently, HSU embarked on the restructuring of two major institutional structures required ensure effective data-driven decision-making into the future: curriculum oversight and institutional research capacity. This chapter describes both the prioritization study and the institutional structure reorganization, which together form the foundation of HSU’s new approach to adaptive management of its programs, resources, and structures.

Realigning Resources through Prioritization

Four different types of institutional activities were assessed via prioritization studies: 1) academic programs (e.g., majors, minors); 2) non-instructional academic support services provided by the Division of Academic Affairs (e.g., library, research facilities); 3) non-instructional programs and services provided by the Division of Student Affairs (e.g., financial aid, career center); and 4) services provided by the Division of Administrative Affairs (e.g., facilities, business services). A separate prioritization process was applied to each of these. The processes, methodology, and results of each of the four prioritization studies are presented in this section.

Prioritizing Academic Programs

From January 2008 through February 2009 Humboldt State University conducted a prioritization of all academic programs. The process was initiated by then Interim Provost Robert Snyder and represents the first systematic, university-wide prioritization of academic programs that has taken place at Humboldt State University. The purpose of prioritization was to collaboratively identify and support the core strengths of the University in alignment with HSU's institutional Vision and to guide resource allocations based upon an evaluation of programs according to agreed-upon criteria.

The overall need for prioritization arose from two key factors. First, in recent history, Humboldt's internal processes have not led to a thorough, comprehensive and comparative evaluation of academic programs across all Colleges. The periodic Program Review process, although generally supported by faculty, had not critically evaluated programs against one another, nor had this process resulted in strategic decisions in relation to the overall configuration of academic programs. Second, declining state support and static overall student enrollment constrained the Academic Affairs budget; if key programs were to be strengthened or new programs added, resources had to be made available by restructuring, reducing, or eliminating other programs.

Methods

The process included a review of all 72 academic programs at HSU that lead to an undergraduate major or minor, certificate, credential, or graduate degree. Each academic department also submitted a report that was used to frame the evaluation of its programs. Evaluation was based on a consistent set of criteria which had been collaboratively developed in consultation with numerous campus groups. The criteria were intended to characterize the nature and quality of programs across several domains (see Appendix XX). The overall prioritization process—including determining the criteria for evaluation, developing program report templates and scoring rubrics, and scoring and ranking programs—was guided by principles of openness, communication, and fairness.

Each program report was scored by two independent review teams, by the Prioritization Task Force (PTF), and by the Deans of the Colleges in which programs were housed. Some university-wide programs were scored by all three College Deans. Individual review teams scored an average of about 18 program reports, whereas the PTF scored all 72 program reports. Deans scored variable numbers of programs depending on the number of distinct programs within Colleges. The PTF then assigned each program to one of five prioritization categories.

Review Team Scoring

Each review team was comprised of one faculty member from each of three different academic disciplines (one discipline from each College) and one individual from a non-academic unit (e.g., library, administration). The team's members were appointed by the President, and a team did not review the programs of faculty serving on that particular team. One individual from each team was appointed by

the PTF as group convener. One reader and one lead discussant were randomly assigned to each program that was reviewed, although all members of the committee were expected to have read, and to participate in discussion of, each program report. Each prioritization group was charged with reviewing its assigned programs and developing consensus evaluation scores (as opposed to numerical averages of individual group member's evaluations) in each of the following weighted areas (percentage weights are in parentheses):

- Vision (15%)
- Demand (20%)
- Quality (30%),
- Cost and Efficiency (20%)
- Potential (15%)

The highest possible score a program could receive was 100 plus 5 additional "bonus points." For a specific program, an overall program score was calculated from the two independent review team scores and the PTF program score as $(\text{Team A} + \text{Team B} + 2 \cdot \text{PTF})/4$. This formula gave the PTF score twice the weight of the individual scores of the two independent review teams, on the basis of two factors. First, individual review teams scored only about 25% of all program reports, whereas PTF members reviewed and scored all 72 program reports. Second, the PTF was composed of seven members, as compared to review teams, which consisted of four members each. The above process for calculating overall program scores did not incorporate scores or comments provided by Deans, as the Deans had access to information that went beyond the reports provided by the individual programs.

Prioritization Categories

Each program was then placed by the PTF into one of the following five categories.

1. **Enhance** - Programs assigned to this category generally received high overall program scores. Investment in these programs should be a priority to strengthen the academic performance of the University.
2. **Maintain** - Programs assigned to this category generally received medium to high overall program scores. Continued support of these programs, at or near their current resource allocation, is central to maintaining the academic performance of the University.
3. **Review** - Programs assigned to this category generally received medium to low program scores. Programs in this category contribute to the academic quality of the university, but curricular reorganization and/or resource reduction is required for long-term viability on contribution of these programs.
4. **Restructure** - Programs assigned to this category generally received low program scores. Restructuring or eliminating these programs will permit the redistribution of resources to other targeted programs and/or will enhance the academic performance of the University.
5. **Revisit** - Programs assigned to this category have been recently restructured and therefore could not be adequately assessed at this time but have potential to contribute to the academic performance of the University. A careful review of these programs should be conducted within the next three years.

In addition to generating numerical scores for program reports, review teams and the PTF provided written comments concerning various aspects of program reports. Such comments would point out, for example, when demand for a particular major was very strong but demand for a specific option in that same major was extremely low or if the cost of a specific option seemed unusually expensive when compared to other options offered in the same major. These comments proved helpful when the PTF assigned programs to the prioritization categories but were not the primary factor on which the PTF based its categorization.

The final categorical rankings in the PTF report (Appendix XX) and separate reports from the College Deans were then submitted to Provost Snyder for review.

Note about Graduate Programs

Standards for review of graduate programs differed from those of undergraduate programs in two important respects. First, the standards by which demand for programs was assessed differed between graduate and undergraduate programs. Specifically, lower threshold values were used for graduate programs than for undergraduate programs to distinguish between levels of demand (note: demand for a given graduate program was measured by numbers of students enrolled in the graduate degree program, and demand for an undergraduate program was measured by number of majors). Second, the degree to which program course offerings were important for other programs was not weighted as heavily for graduate programs as it was for undergraduate programs.

Limitations

The academic prioritization process was intended to be as objective and fair as possible and represents a substantial, positive first attempt at program prioritization at HSU. However, several limitations to the process were apparent. First, the quality of the reports provided to the prioritization committees varied widely. Academic majors and programs with stable leadership and structure provided complete reports that included the required elements. In contrast, the reports for academic minors, general education, and other non-major programs were often incomplete, and many appeared to have been done at the last minute. Second, the review process (e.g., items, rubric, weighting of items, and program ratings by various committees) was limited by some inconsistencies in principal and application, leading to variability in some of the evaluations of certain academic programs. For example, the Recreation Administration program received scores of 90.6 and 79.7 from the two review teams and a score of 67.8 from the PTF, for an overall score of 76.5. This example highlights difficulties with reliability that were apparent in some of the evaluations. Third, some questioned the application of the same review criteria, with the exception of the two differences mentioned above, to both undergraduate and graduate programs.

Results

Of the 72 programs reviewed, 24 had separate options, certificate programs, minors, or other sub-areas that were sufficiently different from the rest of the program to warrant a separate categorization and review. Thus, there were ultimately 98 distinct programmatic entities that were categorized. Given HSU's strong history and focus on the sciences, it was not surprising that six of the top 10 programs were from the College of Natural Resources and Sciences (CNRS). However, several programs, including Geography and Sociology from the College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences (CAHSS), and one program, Economics, from the College of Professional Studies (CPS) were also in the top 10. The program with the highest rating, Wildlife, received an overall score of 88.9, and the program with lowest rating, Physical Sciences, received an overall score of 51.6. Interestingly, individual focus areas within

several of the top-10 programs were targeted for restructuring, i.e., were assigned to Category 4. This result in part reflected programs that had numerous sub-areas with small enrollments. The distribution of the 98 programmatic entities among the five categories was:

Category 1 (Enhance): 12% (n = 12)

Category 2 (Maintain): 35% (n = 34)

Category 3 (Review): 25% (n = 24)

Category 4 (Restructure): 19% (n = 19)

Category 5 (Revisit): 9% (n = 9).

For a complete review of individual program scores and categories please refer to [Appendix XX](#).

In addition to the review scores and categorization, the prioritization review drew attention to several broad areas of curricular concern, including (a) interdisciplinary studies, (b) graduate programs, (c) fragmented or overlapping curricula, (d) faculty overloads, and (e) programs that appear to serve as “escape valves” to allow students to graduate but that otherwise lack obvious justification.

Issues and Recommendations for Future Program Evaluation Efforts

Another key outcome from the academic prioritization process was identification of issues and subsequent recommendations for future program evaluation efforts. Among the issues that were addressed included the need for consistent program data on costs, revenue, student-faculty ratio, teaching effectiveness/learning outcomes, diversity, and student progress toward completion.

Costs. A general lack of consistent data across reports made it difficult to assess programs costs. Some of the inconsistencies resulted from cost-sharing across programs and reporting procedures. Determining program costs was further complicated by the variability in required numbers of units within programs (varying from 30-100 units across all programs), numbers of general education (GE) courses offered by a program, and courses shared among academic units/programs. Finally, some programs reported options that varied widely in regard to costs, further complicating the true cost of a program. Future prioritization efforts should devise methods for equating program costs across campus and for options within programs, and separating program-specific costs from overall departmental costs.

Revenue. Revenues were often attributed to multiple programs or options when in fact they probably emanated from and benefitted directly only one program/option. This sharing of revenues again made it difficult to assess a program’s true revenue allocation. Most revenues appeared to come from grant and contracts, as well as services provided to the campus and local communities. Most of these revenues are undertaken by specific faculty who might be involved in multiple programs/options, often graduate programs. Future prioritizations would benefit from having Principal Investigators/Project Directors allocate percentages of grants and contracts to specific programs/options.

Student Faculty Ratio. The review process used student-faculty ratio (SFR) as a measure of program efficiency. This measure presented several issues, including inflation from high-enrollment required

undergraduate GE courses in a program, deflation from low-enrollment graduate courses/programs, inconsistent reporting of weighted teaching units (WTU), and not counting certain low-SFR courses such as Thesis and Directed Research in SFR calculations.

Teaching Effectiveness/Learning Outcomes. Teaching effectiveness was measured at the undergraduate program level primarily from student writing scores on the Graduate Writing Proficiency Examination (GWPE) and at the graduate program level by admission-to-application ratios. Both of these measures are very limited and do not seem to accurately reflect teaching effectiveness or learning outcomes. As such, measurements of teaching effectiveness and learning achievement deserve considerable revision before HSU undertakes future prioritization efforts, and as the University evaluates program quality.

Diversity. The prioritization reports included attraction and retention of underrepresented student groups as measures of program diversity. Several programs attracted large numbers of underrepresented students, but many of those students did not track across the program, implying attrition in these programs. Future assessments of diversity should include attraction and retention as well as how many students from underrepresented groups actually graduate from programs. Also, an assessment of efforts at increasing diversity recruitment and retention should be included in prioritization. Finally, and especially for programs with traditionally low numbers of underrepresented students, improvements in diversity over time, rather than point-in-time counts may provide a better picture of a program's diversity.

Progress Toward Completion. The data suggest that many programs, especially graduate programs, have long time-to-completion for students. This finding may reflect required course units within a program or differences in declared entry into a major. The use of a graduates-to-majors ratio may help in future assessment of progress toward completion. Future efforts should also include assessments of "migration" data for students switching majors. Finally, any assessment of progress toward completion must also consider differences in required program units, and the effects of transfer students into programs.

Overall, the prioritization process was an important and comprehensive initial effort at prioritizing current academic programs. The process was limited by several factors; nonetheless, the results of prioritization provided several important outcomes, including the identification of key issues currently affecting academic programs and recommendations for future prioritization efforts. The prioritization process has provided HSU with empirical information to make decisions about ,and allocate potential future resources to, academic programs across campus.

The prioritization process has allowed HSU to be better prepared to make informed decisions about potential program elimination, consolidation, and future growth. It has laid the groundwork for decision-making processes that have been necessitated by the budget crisis currently affecting the California State University system. For example, both the process and the outcomes of academic prioritization will inform the ongoing benchmarking process coordinated by the academic deans at HSU. Further, the criteria that HSU developed and used, and the limitations of those criteria identified through the process, have provided a foundation upon which the University can develop more effective approaches to evaluating both existing and proposed academic programs. As such, the academic prioritization process has provided a blueprint from which HSU can build a focused academic identity.

Implementing Academic Program Prioritization Recommendations

Having reviewed the final report of the Prioritization Task Force, the Provost reviewed all of the materials. On March 23, 2009, he forwarded his recommendations (Appendix XX) to the ad hoc Academic Planning Committee, focusing primarily on programs in Category 1 and Category 4 as specified in the Procedure for Post-Program Prioritization Process and the Academic Planning Committee approved by the Academic Senate. Some of the recommendations, however, involved multiple programs in different priority categories within a single department.

The Academic Planning Committee directed four programs recommended for discontinuance to form committees charged with considering the Provost's recommendation. The other programs were directed to collect information, develop plans, or investigate specific alternatives before submitting responses to the Academic Master Planning subcommittee of the newly-formed Integrated Curriculum Committee, the successor to the ad hoc Academic Planning Committee. As of this writing, the Academic Master Planning subcommittee is beginning its consideration of all program responses.

Prioritizing Non-Instructional Academic Support Services

Concurrent with the Prioritization of Academic Programs, Humboldt State University conducted a review and prioritization of non-instructional academic support services units. Among the 25 units included in the review process were each of the three academic Colleges, the Provost's Office, Research and Graduate Studies, the Natural History Museum, the *Coral Sea* marine research vessel, Indian Teacher and Educational Personnel Program, Writing Center, Library, and IT units (see Appendix XX for a complete listing of programs and their individual review summaries). The dissimilarity of the units included in the prioritization review resulted in a challenging review process and limited conclusions that could be applied across units. Nonetheless, the review process did highlight strengths and weaknesses and areas of potential restructuring and change across the units and specific to future prioritization efforts.

Methods

The primary goal of the prioritization process was to assess the status of each of the 25 units in the following six overarching areas:

1. Support for the mission and vision of HSU,
2. Variety of strengths in the program,
3. Clear and appropriate assessment measures,
4. Measureable indicators for comparison to other programs,
5. Potential to maintain or improve quality and capacity, and
6. Adaptability to changes in budgetary constraints or program demand.

The above areas were then distilled into the following four rubric criteria for the prioritization review:

1. Centrality to Mission,
2. Quality/Outcomes,
3. Organizational Context and Efficiency, and
4. Potential Adaptability

A team of nine HSU administrators, faculty, and staff personnel representing the academic Colleges, Provost's Office, Library and other academic support units used the scoring rubric to review the 25 units.

The reviewers individually read each unit's report and then met as a group to develop one overall rating per unit. The rating was intended to reflect the strength of evidence demonstrating the unit's attainment of the six overarching goals within each of the four main rubric criteria outlined above. The review team assessed the level of evidence of strong and meaningful support for the four main rubric criteria using the following ratings:

1. Outstanding,
2. Strong and meaningful,
3. Some meaningful mission and vision, and
4. Little or no evidence.

The review team then developed by consensus a final overall recommendation using the above ratings and specific comments for each unit.

Results and Conclusions

The team members agreed that each non-instructional academic support unit is necessary to the function and purpose of the University and that each unit's human and financial resources are extremely lean in their current state. As such, the review team could not recommend reductions for any of the units. However, the reviewers noted that the individual unit reports were very uneven in quality and approach; some were quite clear and thorough, whereas others did not contain the desired information. The reviewers attributed some of this imbalance to the learning curve associated with this first attempt at prioritization and the challenge of developing an instrument applicable to such diverse units. The reporting format led to information that was irrelevant to the rubric, which suggests that one or both should be re-examined. Future prioritization efforts should incorporate (a) a follow-up assessment of this first time process; (b) recommendations for revising the current reports, rubric, and scoring formats.; (c) sample previous reports that were written well; and (d) a list of FAQs and answers for common mistakes and tips for better report writing.

Prioritizing Non-Instructional Programs and Student Support Services within the Division of Student Affairs

The prioritization process for non-instructional programs and student support services within Student Affairs included a critical review, an appraisal of efficiency, and an assessment of achievement in relation to Humboldt State University's goals, which are adopted from the University's strategic plan. Additionally, the Student Affairs student programs and services were evaluated with respect to the two institutional themes chosen for the WASC self-study. The prioritization process allowed managers to measure a program's combined effect to the stated goals and to align and allocate resources in a structured manner.

Prioritization Model

The Student Affairs management team desired critical analysis and prioritization of all non-instructional programs regardless of organizational structure; the goal was to develop a process parallel to the one being utilized by Academic Affairs. Student Affairs managers created the prioritization process based on Maslow's Hierarchy of Human Development, a theory proposed by Abraham Maslow in his 1943 paper titled *A Theory of Human Motivation*. Utilizing the idea of Maslow's pyramid of humans needs, the management team created a hierarchy for prioritization that included three levels.

1. The first level constituted “mandatory and required services in order to provide a safe educational environment or required in order for education to take place.”
2. The second comprised of “necessary and essential services for promotion of student success and/or student academic achievement.”
3. The third level included “value-added, though not required, programs and services that educate the whole person, enhance student success and/or support other university goals.”

Methods

Department directors and coordinators divided department services into subsets for ranking purposes. Further, the assessment was divided into two separate pyramids: one for programs and services supported by General Fund and a second for all others not supported by the General Fund. Departments evaluated programs and services based on

1. Efficiency, numbers of students/faculty served, academic indicators (e.g. GPA), retention rates, customer satisfaction, and/or benchmarks against other CSU institutions,
2. How services and unit accomplishments aligned with HSU’s 2008-09 goals, and
3. How services and unit accomplishments met progress towards the two WASC themes:
 - *What should a Humboldt State University graduate know?*
 - *Increasing the success of underrepresented students.*

Departments ranked their services by the three levels of the tiered prioritization pyramid and then gathered at an expanded Student Affairs Council and Student Affairs managers meeting to debate the appropriateness of the rankings and negotiate changes to service priorities.

Results and Implementation

Once there was agreement on the rankings of various services, a final document and chart were prepared (see Appendix XX), outlining where on the priority pyramid each service or program stood. This document and chart will serve as a guide for making decisions about the augmentation and/or reduction of services and programs in light of the present budget concerns. Specifically, several positions have already been eliminated, based on the chart, and some restructuring is under consideration. Additionally, the HSU Student Affairs prioritization process has been published by the Educational Advisory Board in their 2009 report, “Managing Through the Downturn: Strategies for Cost-Cutting and Revenue Generation in Student Affairs Organization” (link or Appendix).

Prioritizing Services in Administrative Affairs

On January 15, 2009, President Richmond emailed the campus to advise everyone on developments in the budget situation. Shortly thereafter, Administrative Affairs Vice President Burt Nordstrom called upon the Directors in his division to prioritize their core services and planned a series of meetings to discuss a method and process for doing so. With the help of the campus Quality Improvement Analyst, each business unit in the division was provided a matrix and in late January 2009 conducted meetings to begin classifying their main services.

Prioritization Model

The model of evaluation and prioritization was patterned after the approach used by Student Affairs, which classified main services within administrative departments into three levels. Level One was used to indicate mandatory or required services, projects, and initiatives. Operational or project activities under Level One were required by law or University policy, or were identified as critical by accreditation or external consultants. Level Two was used to categorize services and projects “essential to campus

operations and mission.” Services in Level Two were ones that could not be completed by any other department and were essential to ensure that the campus could operate effectively. Level Three categorized administrative services that were “value-added, but not critical or essential” to the University. Level Three services were identified as those that made a positive impact or benefit but ultimately were not mandated or essential.

Methods

Each major business unit conducted a prioritization meeting with key managers in order to fully capture all services to be scrutinized within the methodology described above. Initial prioritization reports were submitted by Plant Operations, Facilities Management, Business Information Systems, Human Resources, Finance, Risk Management, and Facilities Design. The individual submissions were gathered and consolidated onto a division-wide template. The leadership then conducted a series of meetings to discuss and prioritize the services in a consensus-type format, making sure there was agreement in how the services were prioritized within the matrix.

Results and Implementation

The result was documented in a division-wide services prioritization matrix that was developed, reviewed, and agreed upon by all directors in the division. The matrix was then submitted to the Administrative Affairs Vice President for further review and decision-making (Appendix XX). One result was the elimination of the Facilities Management Interior Design positions, which had been serving as in-house consultants to various campus construction projects. Elimination of the positions allowed the division to meet the proposed reduction in operating expense in the short term, and the effective use of the process positioned the prioritization activity to further aid decision-making about potential cuts during this time of financial uncertainty.

Realigning Institutional Structures to Facilitate Ongoing Improvement

Although the prioritization assessments described above were necessary to begin the process of resource realignment, several key institutional structures themselves required reorganization in order to sustain the alignment of resources with institutional purposes efficiently into the future. In particular, HSU has committed itself to an ongoing process of aligning its resources with its institutional purpose through fundamental changes in its curriculum oversight and institutional research structures.

Realigning Curriculum Oversight

The WASC CPR visiting team underlined the need for a more transparent and cohesive structure for overseeing curriculum processes such as planning and assessment. The Keeling & Associates report also strongly advised a restructuring of the HSU curriculum and academic planning processes. In response to these recommendations, the Provost appointed an ad hoc “Curriculum Review Process (CRP) Working Group” to address issues identified in these reports. The CRP group included four faculty, one student and three administrators. The charge to the group was to develop a new approach to curriculum review that accomplishes a number of goals: a) affirm faculty responsibility for curriculum content, program development, and recommendations regarding curricular resource priorities; b) define administrative and staff roles in curriculum review processes; c) coordinate, at the University level, the multiple components of curriculum review; and d) streamline and expedite review, feedback, documentation, and approval processes.

The CRP Working Group also affirmed a number of related concerns:

- Existing curriculum processes and structures had inhibited cross-college and university-oriented conversation on curricular changes as they are proposed. Instead, a system had developed in which each College planned in isolation from the other Colleges, a university-wide conversation occurred only at the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) level, and then only occasionally and after considerable work had gone into proposal design and review at the College level. Many curriculum proposals (e.g., new courses that were not General Education, program changes) were not routed through the UCC at all but went directly from the College level to the Vice Provost. Also, problems with curricular changes sometimes were not identified until they reached the Office of the Registrar.
- There were no standing faculty-based structures for university-wide academic planning in the form of an Academic Master Plan; further, no criteria existed for evaluating new program proposals in light of potential other uses of limited university-wide resources.
- We had not yet integrated the learning outcomes (Departmental, Diversity and Common Ground, General Education and HSU Learning Outcomes) and related assessment processes into ongoing conversations around academic and curriculum planning. As noted in Chapter One, oversight for General Education curriculum and assessment was fractured, making such integration almost impossible.
- The UCC existed as an administrative committee, charged with making recommendations to the Academic Senate and with advising the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs on various curricular matters. In the past, the Academic Senate was not directly involved with academic and curricular processes beyond policy documents.

The CRP Working Group met one to two days per week during most of the 2008-2009 academic year. The group reviewed a variety of academic planning models from other universities and discussed the range of processes and decisions involved. In particular, the group noted that different curricular processes operated in isolation from one another, so that resource decisions and curriculum structure decisions were artificially segregated. The group then developed a model to meet local needs and goals. Drafts of the proposed new structure, referred to as the Integrated Curriculum Committee (ICC), along with the supporting documents, were shared with the campus community beginning in the early part of the Spring 2009 semester. College curriculum committees and the UCC had already been invited to comment on an earlier draft. The Senate ultimately approved the new ICC model in late spring and implementation began during the summer of 2009.

The ICC is integrated in two directions: horizontally, with representation across all three colleges, and vertically, with representation across all levels of curricular responsibility (staff, faculty, and administration). Core ICC membership comprises twelve faculty members, including a department chair and three members-at-large from each of the three colleges; five academic administrators (the Vice Provost, the three Deans, the Director of Learning Assessment), the Registrar and a staff member from the Office of the Registrar, the Academic Programs staff member who coordinates and tracks the process, and two student representatives. This approach provides for collaborative decisionmaking that incorporates faculty, student, staff, and administrative perspectives, content and resource information. It also provides a structure that supports developing a cohesive university focus, reducing redundancy, building a clear and cohesive GE program, and balancing GE with the needs of major programs, both discipline-based and interdisciplinary.

The ICC is internally subdivided into three subcommittees: the Subcommittee on Course and Degree Changes (CDC), the Subcommittee on Program Planning and Assessment (PPA), and the Subcommittee on Academic Master Planning (AMP). Also, the Academic Policy Committee of the Academic Senate overlaps the structure of the ICC. The ICC sits as a “committee of the whole” every two weeks, with subcommittees meeting in the intervening weeks. All curricular proposals now enter the process through the Academic Programs office, allowing the ICC to track and coordinate curricular decisions.

Proposals or other tasks are passed from the ICC to the appropriate subcommittees, which report their findings and recommendations to the ICC for any final deliberation. The ICC reports its recommendations to the Academic Senate for discussion and approval using a combination of business and consent calendars. By locating curricular oversight in the Academic Senate, the role of faculty and of shared governance is further affirmed. Additional details on the structure and function of the ICC can be found in the Senate Resolution and ICC Constitution ([links or Appendix](#)).

Rethinking Program Review

The California State University system requires regular review of academic programs, but each campus determines the specific format of its reviews. Humboldt State University's Program Review process has been revised several times in the past ten years (see [Appendix XX](#) for the 1997 Guidelines and [Appendix XX](#) for the 2005 Guidelines). Some of the changes to the process have included an adjustment of the cycle length from every five years to every seven years (1999), a student learning assessment requirement, a two-year timeline for the review, and more specific guidelines and structure for the report (2005).

Widespread dissatisfaction with Program Review processes remained, however, despite these changes. The purposes for Program Review were unclear, and delays of several years were common. Often the only direct result of a completed review was eligibility for one-time funding, the amount of which varied each year depending on how many reviews were completed that year. Given the length of the process, there was sometimes a lag time of three years or more between the time that a need for one-time funds was identified in the self-study and the time that the funding committee addressed the request. Some curricular and/or staffing changes were connected to the results of a Program Review, but such connection was neither required nor widely practiced.

When Academic Program Prioritization was initiated in the spring of 2007, the campus suspended regular Program Reviews, after consulting with our WASC staff liaison. The campus anticipated that whatever criteria would be adopted for the Prioritization process would constitute suitable criteria for the next Program Review. To some degree that was correct, but the Prioritization criteria ([Appendix XX](#)) took somewhat longer to develop than anticipated, and a sense emerged that additional information should be appended to departmental Prioritization reports in order to serve as Program Reviews for those programs due to submit them upon resumption of the Program Review cycle. A set of supplementary criteria was developed, and a temporary Program Review process, utilizing the Program Prioritization reports along with the specified addenda, was approved by the Academic Senate and President Richmond in early fall 2008. Program Reviews submitted in 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 follow this temporary process.

In the meantime, the Program Planning and Assessment subcommittee (PPA) of the Integrated Curriculum Committee is in the process of developing a new approach to Program Review. The PPA subcommittee set out to develop a process, timeline, and set of guidelines that will be more effectively incorporated into departmental routines and institutional decision-making. The subcommittee began by considering such resources as the San José State University 2006 Revised Program Planning Guidelines, the draft "WASC Resource Guide for Outcomes-Based Program Review," the WASC "Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews," and the benchmarking and program viability measures developed by the College Deans. The goal is to have the new Program Planning process in place for the 2010-2011 academic year. The PPA also consulted with the Academic Master Planning Subcommittee, which is charged with developing criteria for approving

new program proposals, so that the criteria for approving new programs and the criteria for reviewing existing programs will be in alignment.

Realigning Institutional Research and Analysis Capacity

As the CPR Visiting Team noted, the University must expand its efforts in the area of institutional research in order to better support data-driven decision making. While we have a substantial history of providing student enrollment data, we have been deficient in performing deeper analysis and interpretation. There is a need to better integrate data across the University as well as to develop focused data to contribute to policy and planning recommendations. Further, the institutional research function should be identifiable throughout the University as the primary source of standard measures used for planning and benchmarking.

To meet these objectives, an Institutional Research Office is being formed during the 2009/10 academic year under the direction of the Provost. The initial personnel resources consist of the analyst staff (1.75 FTE), Research Technician (1.0 FTE), and Special Projects Coordinator (.5 FTE), currently within Academic Affairs. Additionally, there are plans to create a new management-level director (1.0) and clerical support position starting in the Spring 2010 term. The Director will have broad participation in University planning activities and will articulate the key management questions for development of data and studies to support decision making. Within the student data realm, there is a long-standing working group of analysts and subject matter experts in Enrollment Management and Academic Affairs. This group will be expanded to include data experts for the areas of finance and human resources to address the areas where more access and integration of data is needed.

The Institutional Research Office will also take a more active role in supporting and coordinating various research efforts. This will include consultation and support for conducting surveys, as well as the development of a more comprehensive data directory to assist the entire campus community in understanding how our data measures connect with business practices. The new research technician position will assist with survey research in addition to expanding the scope of data collection and presentation. The acquisition of survey tools will be investigated so that ad hoc and routine surveys are better supported.

Expanding existing mechanisms for student data reporting, the campus data web site will also provide a channel (request form) through which all data requests will be made. This gives the campus a clear method for making inquiries, ensures appropriate review and collaborative consultation, and helps avoid redundant work. This approach is currently operational for student data requests and publishing (www.humboldt.edu/~anstud). The entire group of analysts and subject matter experts will regularly participate in collaboration meetings as well as routine electronic communications, sharing common data publishing methodology and documentation tools.

Starting with the 2008/09 academic year, the Hanover Research Council has been retained by the Provost to assist in selected institutional research studies, particularly focusing on inter-institutional comparisons. Among several studies, the Hanover group has provided a peer selection methodology and an initial selection of peer institutions. To facilitate comparisons among our peers, we have compiled a data directory of on-line resources for each peer institution. (<http://www.humboldt.edu/~anstud/peers.shtml>). Institutional research capacity has also been augmented by the Educational Advisory Board, which prepared at our request a custom research brief on models for encouraging student participation in academic advising activities. This resource and other

briefs obtained from the organization have informed recommendations regarding academic advising practices.

Prioritization as Adaptive Realignment

Through prioritization, Humboldt State University has jump-started a new, adaptive management approach to achieving its core institutional purpose. Prioritization not only provided much-needed initial data but also generated recommendations for both content and process of future data collection and analysis. Further, by changing the key structures for curriculum oversight and institutional research, HSU has established the mechanisms for collecting, analyzing and using data to support educational objectives. Finally, although neither the prioritization and restructuring efforts described in this chapter were undertaken specifically to address the current, acute budget crisis, both efforts have contributed greatly to HSU's ability to respond to the current budget situation quickly, efficiently and in a proactive rather than reactive manner. Indeed, this is the heart of adaptive management—planning to effectively and proactively undertake change rather than undertaking change reactively only when it is forced upon us.