In 2009 the Board of Trustees directed CWU to make program review a regular and continuous part of the life of the university. The purpose of program review is to

- Optimize programs by ensuring a consistent approach to teaching and focusing program content on university strengths
- Enhance the richness of students’ academic experience
- Ensure time required for quality research and service
- Focus resources on highest priorities.

Continued economic decline has increased the urgency of the trustees’ charge. Now optimizing program offerings is essential in order to address two new exigencies: increased reliance on student recruitment and retention and the loss of half of state funding.

The program review process is nearing culmination. Since 2009 the university has been conducting an in-depth review of the 196 academic programs. In fall 2011 the final phase of the review was launched with the Academic Planning Task Force (APTF). The task force, chaired by Kirk Johnson, dean of the College of the Sciences, including the following membership:

- William Bender, associate dean, College of Education and Professional Studies
- Michael Chinn, associate dean, College of Arts and Humanities
- George Drake, chair Dept. of English
- Kirk Eslinger, director, Faculty and Staff Relations
- Ian Loverro, chair, Faculty Senate
- Joann Peters, chair, Dept. of Chemistry

The job of the task force was to analyze degree programs and, ultimately, recommend whether each should be: maintained, enhanced (when funding becomes available), reduced, or eliminated. In order to perform that evaluation, the task force developed a new method of program analysis and planning that evaluates programs by considering the following factors:

- Number of majors and minors
- Number of degrees awarded
- Service course load
- Credit-hour production
- Program uniqueness

The context for program review, however, was broader than the six criteria. The task force also considered the need for large- and small-plan programs. Small programs require 45 - 59 credits and a minor; large plans require 50 to 75 credits but no minor. The review included a look at specializations within degree programs as well as whether degrees needed to be offered both as bachelor of arts and bachelor of science programs.

The task force considered how to make efficient and effective use of instructional space, and whether programs could increase capacity without adding expense. Discussions included identifying resource interdependencies and links to hidden costs and optimizing the mix of learning environments and student experiences (face-to-face vs. online vs. multi-model/mixed modalities). Other key considerations included roadblocks to student access and success and mechanisms for streamlining work processes.
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Next steps: campus-wide review and discussion of task force recommendations.

The task force completed initial analysis and draft recommendations in November. But much work is left to be done. In December the campus-wide discussion about the work of the task force begins. Input from the Faculty Senate, from department chairs, students and many others will be essential to craft an ongoing process to maintain the focus and quality of academic programs. Departments will have almost two months to comment on and help finalize the planning documents.

The input of faculty will be particularly essential in outlining strategies for programs that should be revised, reduced, or eliminated. Scenarios for revision and reduction will require conversations about revising program vision, mission, learning outcomes, and curriculum. Faculty will consider whether revising a program might require greater or fewer resources and whether the revisions could impact other programs and other departments.

While some programs may be eliminated, it will be in a manner that ensures students are able to complete their degrees. The plan to eliminate a program will outline personnel who may be affected and will follow established policies for such changes. There are no plans to eliminate departments.

NEXT STEPS: CAMPUS-WIDE REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 29</td>
<td>Provost’s Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 30</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 2</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 5</td>
<td>Discussion with Academic Department Chairs Organization and dissemination of spreadsheets to departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 18</td>
<td>Presentation to President’s Advisory Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td>College and program workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb.</td>
<td>Faculty Senate, United Faculty of CWU, Associated Students of CWU board, and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Release final recommendations to campus community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Final recommendations presented to Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>