

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD  
ACADEMIC SENATE

**University Program Review Committee Charge**

RES 171806

FAC

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of CSU Bakersfield recommend to the President that the University Handbook be revised whereby deletions have strike-through, and additions are underlined:

**202.4 ~~Program Discontinuation~~ Program Review**

**202.4.1 University Program Review (UPRC)**

The University Program Review Committee (UPRC) is a faculty committee that is responsible for all CSUB degree and credential programs. UPRC reviews all documents submitted to it from the program, dean, and external reviewer (accreditation findings), in order to assess the extent to which CSUB's programs adopt reasoned strategies and resource allocation decisions for continuous improvement. Thus, it is expected that program faculty will use UPRC feedback to improve program quality.

The UPRC is regarded as an important committee with respect to program continuity and, in that capacity, UPRC can make recommendations for program improvement and advancement. However, from time to time, the UPRC may determine that it is necessary for the campus to stop offering a particular program either on a temporary or permanent basis. In such a circumstance, UPRC may recommend a program moratorium (temporary) or discontinuation.

The UPRC is also responsible for monitoring the overall program review process, recommending changes in the policy and procedures of that process, and assuring that program review findings are used transparently and with accountability to inform 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.

**202.4.2 Program Discontinuation**

The decision to discontinue an approved program is an all-university responsibility. Program faculty, the University Program Review Committee (UPRC), a school or staff dean, or the P&VPAA can initiate the process for discontinuation. The discontinuation policy is found in the Academic Planning Manual.

**RATIONALE:** Currently, there is no charge or description of the UPRC in the University Handbook. This section explains the Charge of the UPRC within the new section 202.4 Program Review.

**Distribution:**

President  
Provost  
AVP Academic Programs  
UPRC Chair

Approved by Senate November 30, 2017  
Sent to President December 7, 2017  
Signed by the President January 4, 2018

## **Program Review Task Force Report**

**Respectfully submitted on May 30, 2017 by the Program Review Task Force: Jacquelyn Kegley, Chair; Steve Bacon, Dean of the School of Social Sciences and Education; Mark Evans, Professor of Economics Emeritus; Doris Hall-Mcphetridge, Chair, Department of Criminal Justice; Many Rees, Professor and Chair of Theatre; Danielle Solano, Associate Professor & Chair, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry.**

The Program Review Task Force met throughout the Spring Semester beginning on April 18<sup>th</sup>. The group met with Dr. Vernon Harper, Associate Vice President for Academic Programs and Dr. Vandana Kohli, Associate Dean, Undergraduate and Graduate Programs; Dr. David Schechter, Vice Provost, Chair of Annual Report Revision Committee; Dr. Kris Krishnan, Assistant Vice President, Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment (IRPA); and Jenny Zorn, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Based upon these meetings and our own discussions we make the following set of recommendations.

### **Proposed Recommendations to Senate & Others**

- **Task Stream Evaluation:** We recommend that a committee be formed to work with Kris Krishnan to evaluate and reconfigure Task Stream. We recommend school Assessment coordinators and at least one chair from each school be represented on the committee.
- **Annual Report: We make the following suggestions to the Annual Report Revision Committee:** (1) That one field instead of multiple fields be provided for the first four questions and a separate field be provided for the faculty accomplishments. (2) We suggest adding a field for feedback from the Deans. (3) n Also there should be a generous character limit for the fields. (4) Finally, we suggest that a preliminary Program Profile [before graduation and final grades posting] be sent early to Chairs.
- **Program Review:**
  - a. Assistance should be provided to faculty in completing the Program Review. The UPRC workshop should be continued and there should be a workshops for Chairs, especially new chairs, every year, to assist them in a hands on with Annual Reports and the Program Review.

- b. We urge that the Deans of the Schools remind the Chairs that Program Review should involve the total program faculty in some meaningful manner.
  - c. The time for program reviews should be seven-year span and although extensions may be granted to programs, the review cycle should be no longer than 10 years.
  - d. It is recommended that representatives of the UPRC and representatives from Accredited programs meet to discuss a separate Program Review Template or process that will be facilitate a streamlined yet adequate Program Review process.
  - e. It is recommended that the Provost, representatives of the UPRC and Deans meet to discussion a revision of the MOUAP that will provide proper closure to the Program Review process.
- **The Task Force approves and sends forth the attached “University Program Review Committee Charge” to the Academic Senate for adoption**

## UNIVERSITY PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

### PURPOSE:

Program review establishes benchmarks and follow-up plans that track progress toward achieving and ensuring alignment of student, programmatic, and university-wide academic goals and objectives. Program review should be centered on the desire to provide a quality university-level program balanced with respect for the needs of society in general and the region in particular, student abilities and interests, and career needs. Most importantly, program review must provide an evidence-based determination of 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 scarce resources and to plan for change. Transparency and accountability is enhanced by tying together the recommendations for program improvement with budgeting, faculty lines and space requirements through a Memorandum of Understanding and Action Plan (MOUAP). The campus systematically integrates the results of program review into planning and budgeting processes.

### CHARGE:

The University Program Review Committee (UPRC) is a faculty committee that is responsible for the systematic evaluation of all CSUB degree and credential programs. UPRC reviews all documents submitted to it from the program, dean, and external reviewer (accreditation findings), in order to assess the extent to which CSUB's programs adopt reasoned strategies and resource allocation decisions for continuous improvement. Thus, it is expected that program faculty will use UPRC feedback to improve program quality.

The UPRC is regarded as an important committee with respect to program continuity and, in that capacity, UPRC can make recommendations for program improvement and advancement. However, from time to time, the UPRC may determine that it is necessary for the campus to stop offering a particular program either on a temporary or permanent basis. In such a circumstance, UPRC may recommend a program moratorium (temporary) or discontinuation.

The UPRC is also responsible for monitoring the overall program review process, recommend changes in the policy and procedures of that process, and assure that program review findings are used transparently and with accountability to inform 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.

### MEMBERSHIP:

The UPRC consists of one faculty member elected by each of the schools and two at-large faculty, as well as one faculty from the Academic Senate membership selected by the Executive Committee, and as a non-voting member, the AVPAP (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 for his/her two-year service.

Sources (text extracted from):

Strategic Plan

Academic Planning Manual

Academic Program Review Policy and Procedures (Approved Senate and President 2010)