

Proposition: 04-25/26

Proposal Type: ☒Bill ☐Resolution ☐Memorial ☐Joint Proposition ☐Other

Title: Faculty Senate input to Academic Program Sustainability Plan Proposal

Date Submitted: 11/17/2025

Sponsor (s): O. Bello (College of Engineering), C. Brown (Geography and Environmental Studies), W. Walker (Department of Anthropology), David Overstreet (NMSU-A)

Proposed Committee: Budget and Planning

Prior Approval: N/A

Proposal: The Curriculum and Planning standing committee hereby requests that the NMSU Faculty Senate review the proposal for the Academic Program Sustainability Plan Proposal drafted and submitted by University Program Approval Committee (UPAC), and the report on the plan which was prepared by the Curriculum and Planning committee and endorse the report.

Rationale: Central administration is seeking for ways to best support “low yield” programs, due to concerns from the legislature about how university funds are being used.

During Summer-Fall of 2024, the University Program Approval Committee (UPAC) prepared a proposal for “Academic Program Sustainability Plan” (APSP) to identify and address “low yield” academic programs at NMSU.

The APSP is designed to identify “low yield” academic programs and establish strategies to support their long-term sustainability through improved enrollment and resource alignment. Its ultimate goal is to ensure that NMSU can allocate resources efficiently, strengthen campus growth, and promote both program viability and overall student success.

The Provost office has expressed the need to formally institutionalize the plan. The proposal evolved from a somewhat negative outlook to a more positive student success approach under Provost Reddi’s guidance by focusing on supporting low

yield program towards sustainability. After being dormant during the current administration's early months, it was recently revived for review by various committees including the Board of Regents and Department Head Academy. In September 2025, the Curriculum and Planning committee was tasked by the Faculty Senate Vice Chair, Christopher Brown, to review the proposal and provide feedback highlighting concerns, questions, and suggestions in relation to the plans outlined in the proposal.

During the Curriculum and Planning deliberations on recommendations to be given, the main concerns that arose and required clarification include how to identify and classify a program as “low yield”. Will the definition of “low yield” vary across departments? What are the metrics to be used to identify “low yield” programs? Currently, the proposed viability metrics focuses on enrollment and degree completion rates. However, no immediate program eliminations are planned. Instead, the emphasis is on gathering and using evidential data to guide discussions and develop sustainable action plans within the departments in order to support identified “low yield” academic programs. The process involves a three-year implementation timeline. The Curriculum and Planning committee anticipates that such action plans would be applicable and adaptable to the context of the identified “low yield” program since not all academic programs are “equal”.

Based on the review by the members of the Curriculum and Planning subcommittee, a comprehensive report has been compiled and attached to this bill. Other documents attached are the draft of the proposal prepared by UPAC and Provost Reddi’s formal invitation to review the proposal.