CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE CHANGES
RES 212230

AAC, BPC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of CSU, Bakersfield adopts the Revised Program Review Policy and Procedures, together with the Self-Study and Program Plan Template as guidelines for future Program Review, and be it further

RESOLVED: That University Administration, in coordination with UPRC and DCLC to consider recommended implementation issues on improving the efficiency and effectiveness of Program Review.

RATIONALE: The recommended changes are a result of an extensive study of Academic Program Review at CSUB. The study included current WSCUC guidelines and program review process at other CSUs. A UPRC Task Force was formed at the end of the academic year 2020-21. The Task Force convened in the academic year 2021-22. The recommended documents reflect the result from the Task Force.

Attachment:
UPRC Revised Program Review Policy and Procedures
UPRC Self-Study and Program Plan Template
UPRC Recommended Implementation Issues

Approved by the Academic Senate April 28, 2022
Sent to the President May 6, 2022
Approved by the President May 12, 2022

Distribution List:
President
AVP for Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs
AVP Faculty Affairs
School Deans
Interim Library Dean
Interim Dean Antelope Valley
Department Chairs
General Faculty

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY AND PROCEDURES

California State University, Bakersfield
Fall 2020

As a university dedicated to meeting the needs of its region and to providing leadership and expertise for students and the community, California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) must actively plan for the future. A program review is an essential component of the active planning process. The program review process is a meaningful way to assess and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of an academic program and allows the members of the program to document successes, needs, and goals for maintaining and/or improving their academic offerings. It involves a program's commitment and willingness to candidly evaluate goals, objectives, and activities through outcomes-based assessment of student learning and to use program review results to improve curricular and budgetary decision-making processes. The required elements of a program review include an evidence-based self-examination, assessment of student learning outcomes, evaluation of resources necessary to ensure quality, and alignment of a program's vision and mission with those of the university.

The program review process is primarily a faculty-driven process. Transparency and accountability are enhanced by tying together the recommendations for program improvement with resource allocation through a Memorandum of Understanding and Action Plan (MOUAP). Consequently, program review is a faculty-led peer review process by which evidence-based findings, conclusions, and decision-making can be used for planning and budgeting. The program review establishes intermediate benchmarks and follow-up plans that track program progress toward achieving and ensuring alignment of student, programmatic and university-wide academic goals and objectives.

PURPOSES OF PROGRAM REVIEW

Program review aims to maintain and strengthen the quality of the university's curriculum and its ability to meet the challenges of the future. Program review should be centered on the commitment to providing quality programs balanced with respect for the needs of society in general and the region in particular, student abilities, interests, and career needs. Most importantly, program review must determine whether students are accomplishing the program's learning objectives through outcomes-based assessment of student learning and development. In this way, the results of program review provide the evidentiary basis for informed, transparent, and accountable decisions about program, faculty and student needs, curricular planning, and resource allocation and management. Through this faculty-driven program review process, the university administration, working collaboratively with the faculty at multiple steps in the process, is better prepared to allocate available resources and to plan for change.

To achieve these purposes, faculty are required to evaluate the program's student learning outcomes, and to use annual assessment findings for continuous program improvement. Such assessment demands that well-qualified internal and external reviewers evaluate the program's learning outcomes, assessment plan, evidence, benchmarking results, assessment impact, and provide feedback for improvement. Program faculty are to prepare a retrospective Self-Study and a forward-looking Program Plan in advance of the next cycle of review. At the end of the process, the campus will systematically integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, through negotiation of formal action plans with mutually agreed-upon commitments.

ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE FOR THE REVIEW PROCESS

PROGRAM SELF-STUDY COMMITTEE

All faculty teaching in the program should have the opportunity to provide input to the program review. Each program conducting a review shall select a Self-Study Committee of at least three faculty members. In consultation with program faculty and representative students, the committee is responsible for the preparation of a Self-Study and a Program Plan document. The committee receives access to the review guidelines and deadlines, a list of model self-studies, and other material. The chair of the department or interdisciplinary program is responsible for ensuring the timely and thoughtful completion of the program review. The title page of the program review document shall state that by a majority vote the program faculty has approved the Self-Study and the Program Plan document and include the date on which the approval was made. If students and/or staff are involved in the self-study preparation process, their involvement should be limited to a support role such as data collection and creation of graphs. The writing, analysis, and recommendations must be completed by faculty.

EXTERNAL REVIEW

Programs that are not accredited by external bodies shall have an external review performed as part of the program review process. The program, in consultation with the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs (AVPAA) and the school dean, proposes an external reviewer who does not have any conflicts of interest and has the experience to provide an effective review. The external reviewer must be approved by the UPRC. The Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA)maintains a fund to pay for the external reviewer.

The purpose for the external review is to assist faculty in improving program quality by providing a comparative perspective on the program, a reflection on the last seven years of operation, and plans for the next seven years. The external reviewer will conduct an exit interview with the program faculty, the chair of the UPRC (or designee), the appropriate school dean, the AVPAA (or designee), and the Provost and VPAA. Within two weeks of the completion of the visit, the external reviewer will provide a draft of the external report to the program faculty and the Office of Academic Programs that provides comments and recommendations regarding the program. The program faculty has up to two weeks to submit any corrections of

factual inaccuracies and misunderstandings. The external reviewer shall submit the final report to the Office of Academic Programs to become part of the package of documents subsequently reviewed by the appropriate school dean, the UPRC, and the Provost and VPAA.

SCHOOL DEAN REVIEW

School deans oversee assessment processes, management of resources and strategic planning activities. Thus, it is imperative that they review and respond to the self-study, program plan, and related documents. The school dean shall add another review within a month of receiving the external reviewer's report reflecting upon the comments and recommendations of the external reviewer. In the case of interschool programs, all relevant deans shall add their comments and recommendations.

UNIVERSITY REVIEW

Upon receiving the documents written by the Program Self-Study Committee, the external reviewer(s), and the school dean, the UPRC engages in a review of the program. The UPRC consists of one faculty member elected by each of the schools, two at-large faculty, one faculty appointed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee, and a non-voting member, the AVPAA or designee (*ex officio*). To ensure continuity in UPRC operation, the members shall serve two-year staggered terms. Each member is given three WTUs of assigned time per year for the two-year service.

The UPRC will examine all documents submitted during the review and prepare its comments and recommendations. These are forwarded to the Office of Academic Programs. The UPRC shall also monitor the overall program review process, recommend changes in the program review policy and procedures, and ensure that program review findings are incorporated into university-wide curricular and budgetary planning processes. Finally, at the end of the academic year, the chair of the UPRC shall submit to the Academic Senate a summary of the major findings and recommendations for all programs reviewed that year.

PROVOST REVIEW

Within three months after receiving the program review documents, the Provost shall meet with the program faculty, the chair of the UPRC (or designee) and school dean(s) to discuss the program review and all recommendations. Within a month of the meeting, the Provost and VPAA (or designee), through active negotiation with the program faculty and appropriate school dean, shall prepare a MOUAP that identifies the agreed-upon recommendations to be implemented, as well as the resources that will be provided to support those recommendations, during the next seven years. The MOUAP will be signed by the department chair or program director, the school dean, and the Provost and VPAA, kept on file in the department, the school, and the Office of Academic Affairs, and remain in effect for the duration of the review cycle. The program faculty and the school dean shall be responsible for implementing the recommendations.

ANNUAL REPORTS

The annual report is an important component of the program review process that provides an opportunity for the program faculty to reflect upon and document their continuous improvement efforts. The content of the annual report includes updates on the progress made toward accomplishing the actions stated in the MOUAP and relevant changes since the last program review and/or annual report in response to emerging student needs, resource pressures, and data points. Annual reports are normally due on October 1 of each academic year and are submitted to the school dean for review.

The Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA) prepares data annually for each program, including the number of students, faculty, degrees granted, and instructional cost. The program faculty shall update additional tables indicating the work that has been done over the last year on assessment of student learning outcomes, faculty activity, and funding plans, and prepare a narrative clarifying and explaining the data and discussing any emerging trends. If the program has a MOUAP, the program faculty shall evaluate the extent to which the program goals or benchmarks have been met and report the status of agreed-upon resource allocations. The cumulative data and narratives will provide the foundation for the next program review.

REPOSITORY AND REPORTING

Copies of all program review documents shall be maintained in the Office of Academic Affairs.

PROCEDURES FOR ALL PROGRAMS WITH EXTERNAL ACCREDITATION

All programs at CSUB undergo periodic academic program review. Programs that are externally accredited may conduct a modified program review, in which they meet the requirements for campus program review in an alternate fashion. In the year following the external accreditation, accredited programs will submit to the UPRC their accreditation documents, which include the accreditation self-study reports, letters and correspondence from the accrediting body, review team reports, responses to accreditation correspondence, accreditation action/decision letter, and other relevant material. In addition, programs should indicate to the UPRC where the required information for campus program review is located in the accreditation reports. For any items of the program review that are not addressed in the external accreditation reports, programs will need to provide the information in a separate response and submit it to the UPRC. Additionally, the school dean must submit a review if not involved in the accreditation process. Once these documents are received, the UPRC will review the material and produce a report, followed by the Provost and VPAA review that culminates in a MOUAP.

MID-CYCLE REPORTS

In some cases, the UPRC may request that a program submit a mid-cycle report to provide an update on any specific recommendations made in the last program review. Mid-cycle reports are typically submitted to the UPRC in the third year after completion of the program review.

PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM REVIEW EXTENSIONS

Under extenuating circumstances, a program may request an extension, not to exceed one year in length of its program review. The request must include a justification for the extension, and an acknowledgement of the school dean. Upon receiving the request, the UPRC will discuss and vote on it, and the UPRC Chair will notify the program if the request is approved.

When programs have not submitted a self-study after one year of their initial deadline, the UPRC shall meet with the Provost and VPAA, the program director or department chair, and appropriate school dean(s) to decide how to proceed. An additional extension may be granted if appropriate, or, *the UPRC would make a recommendation to the Provost on how to proceed, which may include a UPRC-initiated review.*

REVISED BY THE UPRC March 24, 2022
Amended by the Academic Senate April 28, 2022
APPROVED BY ACADEMIC SENATE April 28, 2022
APPROVED BY PRESIDENT X

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

Program Review Timeline

Academic Year 1

August   Programs notified one year in advance of Self-Study due date.

September   Programs appoint committee and Chair to carry out Self-Study. Programs notify
                UPRC of Chair and committee members. If necessary, the chair initiates a
                meeting with Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (AVPAA) to review
                policies and procedures.[1]

October   Chair and committee members attend UPRC workshop.

February   Chair checks in with UPRC Chair apprising of progress toward completion of the
                Self-Study and Program Plan.

Academic Year 2

September 15   Program Committee sends completed Self-Study and Program Plan electronically
                to UPRC Chair and delivers two hard copies (including all appendices), double-
                sided and spiral bound, to the Office of Academic Programs. Committee Chair
                and Dean recommend to AVPAA two to three external reviewers at the time of
                submission.

October 1   The Office of Academic Programs, in consultation with the Provost and Vice
                President for Academic Affairs (the Provost and VPAA), Dean, and Program, sets
                a time for the campus visit and exit interview. The program coordinates a
                schedule that includes meeting with the Dean, faculty, students, and all other
                interested parties.

October/   External reviewer (if program is not externally accredited) conducts an on-site
November   visit to examine program and assess the Self-Study and Program Plan. The visit
                culminates with an exit interview with the Program Director/ Department Chair,
                faculty, School Dean, Chair of the UPRC, the AVPAA, and the Provost and VPAA.

December   Dean provides written comments and recommendations.

February/   UPRC submits a report to Program Director/Department Chair, with a copy to
March   Dean, Provost and VPAA, and Chair of the Academic Senate.

April   The Provost and VPAA (or designee), in consultation with the Dean and Program
                faculty, develops a draft MOUAP. The finalized MOUAP is signed by the Program

---

[1] For accredited programs, programs without a designated faculty, and programs with undergraduate and graduate
degrees, please consult AVPAA about program review policies and procedures.

Director/Department Chair, Dean, and Provost and VPAA, and then forwarded to the UPRC and AVPAA.

May   UPRC submits an annual report to the Chair of the Academic Senate, which includes all program reviews from that academic year, and a summary of this report is given to the Academic Affairs Committee.

Recommendations for completion of the Self-Study and Program Plan

The UPRC recommends the following in the preparation of the Self-Study and Program Plan:

1. For programs that include both undergraduate and graduate programs, either each program is reviewed separately, or if combined, the review must specify ways to address the review requirements for each program.
2. The UPRC has members who may be unfamiliar with the discipline being reviewed. It is helpful to avoid too much discipline-specific jargon and/or bring them up to speed with introductions, where necessary. Whenever extensive use of jargon or acronyms is required, a glossary should be provided to assist the reviewers.
3. Evidence-based claims and requests are essential components that precede a UPRC endorsement of a program request. For example, a request for a tenure-track hire will be better received if the argument goes beyond "replacement of lost faculty lines" or "necessary expertise" and also establishes need for the new hire based on meeting enrollment demand within a sustainable student-to-faculty ratio and addressing the current proportion of entitled faculty within the unit.
4. Pages must be sequentially numbered.
5. The UPRC would appreciate a double-sided format and spiral binding, if size is extensive. An electronic copy and two complete hard copies (including all appendices) should be submitted to the Office of Academic Programs.
6. Figures and tables should be numbered, have proper titles and captions, and be referenced within the text.
7. While the UPRC recommends page limits for major sections of the Self-Study and Program Plan, it is important for the program faculty to address all the points in the template thoroughly.

Please use the following template face page and content headings.

Department of [Insert Dept. Name]
California State University, Bakersfield

[LIST DEGREE PROGRAM TITLE(S)]
SELF-STUDY AND PROGRAM PLAN

AY 20XX-20XX through AY 20XX-20XX

Certification

This is to certify that:

- This document was developed by [insert names of Self-Study committee chair and members].
- This document was approved by majority vote of the program faculty on [insert date).
- All program/department faculty members (full- and part-time) were given the opportunity to provide feedback to the document.

Signature: _____ (Self-Study Committee Chair) Date: _____

NOTE FOR ACCREDITED PROGRAMS: For content that is included in the programs' accreditation reports, relevant material may be inserted or referenced in the Self-Study and Program Plan document.

I.   TABLE OF CONTENTS

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (approximately 1 page)
Briefly describe the role of the program within the university context; identify the program's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges to improvement; and provide future directions for program maintenance and improvement.

III. SELF-STUDY
   A. What has changed since the previous review? (approximately 2-3 pages)
   1. How were the recommendations from previous External Reviewer, UPRC, and Provost addressed by the Program?
   2. Other relevant changes may be included here if not discussed elsewhere.

   B. Program's role in relationship to the university (approximately 2 pages)
   1. Relate the Program mission, goals, and objectives to those of the University.
   2. Describe the relationship between program learning outcomes (PLOs) and university learning outcomes (ULOs).
      - The UPRC suggests the use of an alignment matrix – see last page of the template. It can serve as a useful tool for understanding how PLOs and ULOs are aligned.
   3. Provide a curriculum map in the Appendix and use it to describe how the curriculum is designed and how that design addresses the PLOs.
   4. Briefly describe the program's role in all associated programs that significantly affect the degree program resources (General Education and other university-wide requirements, developmental coursework, service courses for other majors, certificate programs, interdisciplinary programs, minors, pre-med, pre-law, etc.).

   C. Evidence of program quality (approximately 20 pages, excluding graphs and tables)
   1. Evidence of student learning outcomes (SLOs) based on the Program assessment criteria
      a. Use SLO data to demonstrate program quality as it relates to the degree.
      b. Disaggregate and compare data by mode of delivery (online, remote ITV, face-to-face), by campus location (Bakersfield, AV, or Extended Education), and other significant populations.
      c. Changes in the curriculum brought about by assessment of SLOs
      d. Placement of students in careers, graduate/professional programs
      e. Measures of student involvement in scholarship or creative activities
      f. Feedback from alumni (e.g., alumni satisfaction surveys), Advisory Boards, and/or employers (e.g., employer satisfaction surveys)
   2. Evidence of faculty and program effectiveness

a. Measures of successful degree completion
b. Analyze student retention and graduation measures (graduation rates, time-to-degree, units at degree), describing efforts to improve such measures.
c. Describe how the CSUB Program compares to similar programs at other universities in terms of curriculum requirements, SFR, number of faculty, and graduation rates.
d. Record of peer-reviewed scholarship for each faculty member (e.g., grants, professional presentations, journal articles, books, book chapters, monographs, exhibitions, performances, and creative works).
   - The UPRC recommends summarizing this information in a table.
   - Do not include scholarship prior to the last review.
   - Provide indicators of quality that may not be apparent outside of the discipline (e.g., indicate peer-review status and impact factor, where applicable).
   - Describe how the scholarship has enhanced the degree program.
3. Evidence of how the Program serves the community
   a. Describe Program activities for applied learning.
   b. Field placements, internships, practice-based learning opportunities, grant partnerships, etc.
   c. Efforts to recruit students and faculty who reflect the diversity of the community

D. Evidence of program viability and sustainability (approximately 10 pages)
1. Analyze trends for demand and need for the Program
   a. Numbers of student majors, applications and admits in the case of post baccalaureate programs, enrollments, and degrees granted since the previous review
   b. Trends within the profession, local community or society generally that identifies an anticipated need, or lack thereof, for the program in the future (including, if available, market research)
2. Faculty resources
   a. Proportions of faculty ranks, SFR, cost/FTES, class size and FTES by category
   b. Trends since the previous review
   c. Faculty workload (i.e., direct WTU teaching assignments and reassigned time by faculty member) disaggregated by course category (GE, major, service, developmental)
   d. Professional and leadership development
   e. Mentoring of faculty
   f. Retention and succession planning
3. Financial resources
   a. Analyze the operational budget (revenues and expenditures).
   b. Percentage of external funding in relationship to operational costs
   c. Assessment of administrative support services
4. Supplies, equipment, and other resources, as appropriate
   a. Information and Technology Resources

      b. Equipment
      c. Facilities
  5. Oversight and management of required resources

IV. PROGRAM PLAN (approximately 15 pages)

The Program uses the evidence-based inquiry and analyses documented in the comprehensive Self-Study to inform future planning for program maintenance and improvement.

In the Program Plan, the program faculty should consider how the results from their Self-Study can be used to:

A. Inform long-term planning
1. What are the program's goals for the next seven years?
2. How will the program specifically address any weaknesses identified in the Self-Study?
3. How will the program build on existing strengths?
4. Where can the formation of collaborations improve program quality?

In addressing such questions, program faculty should consider how program review results are used in the planning and budgeting progress, for program review provides a way for institutions to link evidence of academic quality and student learning with planning and budgeting. That is, the findings in the Self-Study, the recommendations in the external review, and responses to previous reviews can be used as evidence to inform decision-making processes at various levels in the institution, from the program-level through the university-level.

B. Inform curriculum planning
1. Providing the program's assessment plan for the next review cycle
2. Address the following items when applicable:
    a. Changing the sequence of courses in the major curriculum
    b. Adding or deleting courses
    c. Refinement or articulation of pre-requisite or disciplinary requirements
    d. Re-design of the content or pedagogy of specific courses

    The primary questions driving such changes would be:
- Are our students achieving the desired learning outcomes for the program?
- If not, what elements of the curriculum could be changed to improve learning?

C. Assess changes in how resources are used within the program
    Address the following items when applicable:
1. Evaluating whether current offerings are the right mix going forward. Should some programs be placed on moratorium, discontinued, or return from moratorium? Should new programs be developed?
2. Assignment of faculty to teach specific courses or sections

3. Changing the scheduling of certain courses or the frequency with which they are offered.
4. Changing the number of students required in course sections so that student learning and effectiveness of teaching are maximized.
5. Implementing improved advising and support services to increase learning, retention, and/or graduation rates.
6. Adjusting the allocation of faculty resources across General Education, the major, and the graduate program (if appropriate).
7. Providing additional professional development or research resources for faculty.
8. Adjusting faculty teaching loads and assigned/release time.

Some guiding questions that could be addressed are:
- What internal improvements are possible with existing resources (through reallocation)?
- How can resources within the department be allocated in such a way as to better achieve the mission and goals of the department?
- At what point in the prioritization of departmental goals do these recommendations fall?
- What are the costs of each recommendation (both the direct monetary cost and the opportunity cost in the form of lost resources for other initiatives)?
- What is the extent of departmental funds available and where might the department turn for external funding?

D. **Make recommendations for how resources outside the program should be used**. (May want to refer to the section on Supplies, Equipment, and Other Resources)

E. **Make a case to the dean and to the University Program Review Committee for specific additional resources as indicated**. For example, the program may request:
1. Additional or reduction of faculty or support staff
2. Additional funds to support faculty professional travel or research
3. Release time for program assessment activities, curriculum development or research-related activities
4. A reduction or increase in program enrollment target
5. What improvements can only be addressed through additional resources?

V. APPENDICES
Provide supporting evidence that is too detailed to be included in the text itself but may be referenced throughout. In addition to those appendices outlined below, the program may choose to add its own (e.g., accredited programs should include accreditation documents).

A. **Academic Program Data Profile (provided by IRPA)**
B. **Curriculum Map**
C. **Up-to-date catalog copy**

D. Roadmaps to graduation
E. Faculty Abbreviated Vitae (2 pages each)

Alignment Matrix

The following example shows the relationship between program learning outcomes (PLOs) and University Learning Outcomes (ULOs). In this example, ULOs are listed in the vertical axis and -PLOs are listed in the horizontal axis. An "X" indicates alignment.

	Goal I					Goal II			Goal III				Goal IV			
	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	2.1	2.2	2.3	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4
1A	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X				X	X	X	
1B						X	X		X				X			
1C						X								X		
1D	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X				X	X	X	
1E						X										
1F	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X						
2A						X	X		X				X			
2B						X								X		
2C	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X						X	
2D	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X				X		X	
3A	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X						
3B	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X					X	
3C						X										
4A	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X						
4B	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X						
4C	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X						
5A																
5B						X						X				
5C																
5D						X						X				
5E	X	X	X	X	X	X						X				
6A							X			X						X
6B																
6C							X		X	X					X	
6D						X							X	X		

Recommended Implementation Improvements for Program Review

Suggested improvements to the implementation of program review:

1. Support for faculty engaged in writing of the program review
    a. All program review committee members should be involved in the program review. However, proper compensation for the writer(s) of the program review shall be provided.
    b. Data support for departments
        i. IRPA must provide accurate data in a timely manner.
        ii. University Advancement should provide alumni database support.
        iii. Assessment support is needed year-round.
2. Resource allocation, including faculty expansion hires, may be contingent on a completed program review.
3. If a program review is not completed in a timely manner, it will be addressed in the program chair's review.
4. MOUAP must be signed and completed within a year that the UPRC completes its review.
5. UPRC, DCLC and Deans to collaborate on an annual report template that serves to assist the completion of program review.