



Academic Prioritization Policy

RES 232425

AAC & BPC

- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate opposes the Chancellor's Office definition of "low-degree conferring programs" and urges the Chancellor's Office to allow campuses to develop their own timeline, process, and measures for identifying programs in need of action.
- RESOLVED:** That the attached Budget Prioritization Task Force Final Report be reaffirmed.
- RESOLVED:** That an Annual Report Taskforce be formed by the Senate Executive Committee to revise the Annual Report process to address the Budget Prioritization Task Force recommendations for qualitative and quantitative data. This taskforce should be composed of at least one faculty member from each school and an additional faculty member from the UPRC. Faculty on this committee should be familiar with the annual report process (i.e., former or current department chairs) and include representation from "low-degree conferring programs". The AVP Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs and one school Dean should be included on this committee as well. IRPA staff should be consulted as required.
- RESOLVED:** That IRPA provide the quantitative data recommended by the Budget Prioritization Task Force to Department Chairs and Program Directors at least 60 days prior to the deadline for annual reports.
- RESOLVED:** That the Annual Reports be reviewed and discussed collectively by the relevant program directors, department chairs, and Deans.
- RESOLVED:** That based on the review of the Annual Report, an action plan should be developed for programs at risk of being identified as "low degree-conferring" and must be developed for programs identified as "low degree-conferring".
- RESOLVED:** That recommendations made in an action plan should consider multiple factors, including, but not limited to, the protection of instruction, the mission of the university, contributions of the program to the discipline and the general education program,

financial and budget impacts, community needs, impacts of discontinuance of a program on other university programs and future prospects of a program.

RATIONALE: Given that the CSU is facing on-going fiscal challenges, a policy and process for the regular review of academic program performance separate from the academic program review process is needed. Review of annual reports can be inconsistent and best practices dictate that these reports should be reviewed, and feedback provided to programs. This stems from a memorandum from the Chancellor's Office to CSU Presidents, dated October 5, 2023, when campuses were asked to include a review of "low degree-conferring programs" in the academic planning reports. Per a 1971 memo, the Chancellor's Office defines "low degree-conferring programs" as those baccalaureate programs producing fewer than 10 degrees in a year and those post-baccalaureate programs producing fewer than 5 degrees in a year. Additionally, campuses were expected to develop and submit action plans for programs identified as in need of action.

Attachments:

Budget Prioritization Task Force Final Report

Distribution List:

President
Provost and VP for Academic Affairs
VP Student Affairs
AVP Faculty Affairs
AVP Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs
AVP IRPA
School Deans
Dean of Libraries
Dean of Antelope Valley
Dean of Extended University and Global Outreach
Department Chairs
General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate: May 9, 2024

Sent to the President: May 23, 2024

President Approved: