



DATE: May 8, 2025
FROM: Rebecca Joseph, Chair, Program Review Subcommittee
TO: Andre Avramchuk, Academic Senate Chair
CC: Recording Secretary, Rhonda Roquemore, Vanessa Shih
SUBJECT: Annual Senate Committee Report

Policies/Items completed during 2024-2025

While we are not a policy making committee, we do coordinate the program review process and see many ways we could impact future campus policies. Our two year process starts in year one with helping the the new review programs understand the process, draw needed data, and get support. The second year, we help coordinate the external review process, create questions for programs, meet with programs, and then prepare a final report. This year, David Connors helped **seven** programs get trained for One. In 2024-2025, we completed the year two process for the Music, BA, MA, BM, MM programs, Audiology Doctorate, Child and Family Studies BA and MA, Journalism BA, and Industrial Management, MS.

We also invited new provost Heather Lattimer to visit our committee, which she did in late March. We introduced her to our work and several systemic challenges on campus that we felt she could begin to address. She expressed interest in attending future meetings.

Ongoing Policies/Items

We will carry over Communication Studies BA, MA, Urban Learning BA, Theatre BA, TFT, MFT, Material Science and Engineering, MS, Television Film and Media Studies, BA MA- Modified, and Television Film and Theatre MFA. We experienced some challenges getting materials in time from several programs and finding external reviewers for one programs. Some programs experienced leadership vacuums, while others did not submit their materials on time. We will carry over the six programs and begin the entire Year Two Process for the seven 2025-2026 Year One Programs— David Connors was a great addition as our Executive Secretary this year. We will him well as he cycles off.

Future Policies/Items and Recommendations

We really appreciate having an EPC representative on the committee. Kirsten is a great addition. We also had many new members this year, which added unique new perspectives and valuable questions. Our committee truly thrives when we have full participation from member colleges. In addition to the librarian member, we would still like to have an instructional technology member on our committee next year.

Feedback and Recommendations

We have a cross-campus view of all programs. We see many trends that cut across all programs.

1. **Detrimental Hiring Freeze.** The 100 percent campus hiring freeze is hurting our campus in many

ways, especially in creating huge vacuums in staff and faculty. We believe that key investments in labor would help us raise money and grow programs. Each program we met with this year had key faculty or staff needs that if filled could help the program continue to improve and grow. Music was one prime example. The music program could provide their talents to major events like Commencement, lend expertise to cross campus programs from computer science to engineering, and renting out space to community members. Key staff are missing to prevent this expansion from occurring.

2. **Program Advisors-Staff and Faculty.** Our program advisors are critically important members of our community. Faculty should not have to compete for release time to perform their critically essential work. Key staff need to be replaced when they leave because of core functions not being performed or leaked over to faculty, across union contracts.
3. **Lecturers.** Our lecturers do the lion share of work on our campus and deserve intentional staffing. They often are given more than four preps each semester, when they could easily be given more streamlined schedules. They also do remarkable work through their service to our campus-running programs, advising students, co-planning with peers, and serving on committees. They deserve better treatment.
4. **Chairs.** Chairs do such extraordinary work, and we believe they can benefit from even more support. Programs without staff in their offices are struggling, and our campus needs to rethink its staffing formulas.
5. **Recruitment.** We believe that we need professional recruiters to help our outstanding programs get more students. Relying on professors is not the most effective route. Several programs on campus lost their professional recruiters, who were not replaced.
6. **Curriculum.** Programs continue to find Curriculum unwieldy and would benefit from updates and increased functionality. They receive many mixed messages from Undergraduate Studies.
7. **Alumni.** Our alumni are a major source of strength for us for networking, internships, and job prospects. We need a more proactive, centralized alumni office that actively works with alumni. Our alumni should be able to keep their emails, like our peer campuses. We could continue to reach them after they leave, and we need access to them to increase fundraising as well.
8. **Fundraising.** Individual programs should be able to fundraise as they have unique connections. Leaving fundraising to campus levels with professionals covering many colleges leaves out many external funding sources given our loss of federal grant money.
9. **Best practices.** Throughout our work, we have learned about the best practices our extraordinary programs offer from advisory boards to internship programs to lecturer onboarding to support classes. We would like the university to do more to highlight best practices across campus.
10. **Membership.** The work of program review committee is so extensive and so important, that we wish more professionals on campus would want to serve on our committee, as next year we will have 11 programs to shepherd through.
11. **Dissemination.** The process of program review is so expansive and critical to the thriving of our campus that we wish more people could benefit from the findings that we produce. We believe that the MOU should be shared at a townhall of program faculty.