

1                                   **Resolution in Support of the Report of the Workload Task Force**

2  
3   WHEREAS, The reporting of faculty workload has far-reaching implications for the  
4   campus and the CSU system, including budgeting and curriculum planning; and

5  
6   WHEREAS, A joint task force of faculty and administrators was convened to study the  
7   methods used for reporting faculty workload and to make recommendations for  
8   improvements to same; and

9  
10   WHEREAS, The task force submitted its findings and recommendations to the provost's  
11   Academic Affairs Leadership Council (AALC) and the Senate's Executive Committee (EC);  
12   and

13  
14   WHEREAS, The report has been discussed in various forums including a town hall  
15   meeting, Senate meetings, and joint AALC/EC meetings; and

16  
17   WHEREAS, The Task Force's report includes recommendations for achieving consistency  
18   in reporting methods and for valuing the diverse nature of faculty responsibilities; and

19  
20   WHEREAS, Questions remain concerning a number of aspects of workload reporting  
21   (i.e., how to report service, how best to report the work associated with the writing  
22   requirement, changes from C to Z factors, college specific issues, relationship to SFR  
23   calculations and budget issues); now, therefore, be it

24  
25   RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of CSUSM endorse the report of the Workload  
26   Task Force; and be it further

27  
28   RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of CSUSM endorse the AALC/EC decision to form  
29   a joint Next Steps Task Force to make recommendations concerning the unresolved  
30   aspects enumerated above as well as other comments received by the joint task force,  
31   to make a recommendation regarding implementation for AY 2011/12, and to submit its  
32   recommendations to the AALC and EC by November 30, 2010; and be it further

33  
34   RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of CSUSM express its appreciation to the  
35   Workload Task Force for a job well done.

## Comparison of Current and Revised Program Review Procedures

OLD VERSION	NEW VERSION
There was no policy as such, document outlined philosophy and procedure.	The new policy with separate guidelines providing procedure and specific instructions.
While student learning outcomes were part of the items to be addressed during program reviews there was no specific reporting of assessment.	Accreditation bodies and the CSU have placed increasing focus on assessment of student learning and reporting therefore, assessment reports are incorporated into the program review.
Repeated every 5 years	Assessment is on-going. Cycle is 5-7 years.
Comprehensive review. Department addresses 9 topics, one of which is student learning outcomes. Others are design of degree program, student readiness, graduates, advising, enrollments, pedagogy and instruction, resources, and extracurricular activities.	Content of review begins with reflection on achieving educational objectives (SLO's) on student learning outcomes by examining annual assessment data, followed by a section on developing and allocating resources and concluding with the selection of not more than two additional themes/special interests.
Data Notebook required departmental action	Data Notebook contents identified by department, located by IPA and OPA Faculty Fellow and provided to the department.
Lack of guidance on structure of narrative.	Includes instructions for report structure and content. Also a model outline is provided (sections VI and VII).
PAC and External Reviewer roles unclear	Clarifies roles of PAC, External Reviewers and others. (Sections V and IX for PAC and VIII for External Reviewers)
Little or no specific funding or support.	Support from Learning Outcomes Assessment Fellow on PSLOs and from OPA Faculty Fellow on data notebook development. Other resources for programs under review are under discussion.
Usually one External Reviewer	Provides for 2 External Reviewers, whenever possible. Includes specific information on visit and expectations.
Planning report required	Part of narrative includes discussing future goals. Section 5 (p.17)
Few specifics on Masters programs	Graduate programs included throughout.
Senate receives end of year report.	Senate Office receives end of year report, including MOU's generated through the review process.
Includes mention of system for ad-hoc committee to review viability of program	New policy on discontinuation of programs being developed that would be informed by/initiated after PR process. Includes 5 levels of recommendations.
Planning report has only mention of MOU but specifics were vague. The program review report became "baseline" for next PEP.	Includes final meeting and MOU for future goals/developmental plan. (Section X)