1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK**
   - Ethnic Studies Update
   - Budget Forum Debrief

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   - October 6, 2020 Minutes
   - October 13, 2020 Minutes

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

5. **CONTINUED ITEMS**
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (R. Gearhart)
      ii. AS&SS (C. Lam)
      iii. FAC (M. Rees)
      iv. BPC (B. Street)
   b. Provost Update
   c. Searches
   d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – PBTF
   e. Ethnic Studies Unit Implementation Taskforce

6. **NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS**
   a. Online SOCIs
   b. IRB Response to EC Questions and Appointments (handouts)
      i. IACUC re-appointment as alternate member
      ii. IRB re-appointment Tunson
      iii. IRB re-appointment Williamson
   c. Handbook 306.2.2.e (handout)
   d. Elections and Appointments (handout)
      i. School Elections Committees
      ii. Committee proliferation
iii. Appointments to TEAC, USP&BAC, and UPAC (handout)
e. Ally software (handout)
f. APM Proposal – GECCo (handout)
g. FYS Instructors and GECCo structure (handout)
h. EEGO course offerings – Summer Term
i. Post-Tenure Review Requirements
j. Time Certain for Agenda at Senate - (10:05)

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING OCTOBER 29, 2020 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)**
   - Announcements
   - President Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10)
   - Consent Agenda
   - Reports
   - New Business
   - Old Business
   - RES 202108 Master of Science in Computer Science
   - Open Forum and Wellness Check
   - Past Senate Chair, Jackie Kegley (Time Certain 11:15)

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

9. **ADJOURNMENT**
ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, October 6, 2020
10:00 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.
Videoconference

Members:  A. Hegde, M. Danforth, J. Millar, M. Martinez, M. Rees, R. Gearhart, C. Lam, B. Street, D. Boschini, V. Harper
Absent:  M. Martinez

1. CALL TO ORDER
   A. Hegde called the meeting to order.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK
   • Budget Forum - October 19, 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 Noon Zoom videoconference. The link will be distributed upon finalization of the agenda.
   • Faculty Trustee nominations – CSUB and CSU Humboldt will participate in the committee reviewing the nominees. The committee meets in January. Two years ago, a Faculty Support Petition was distributed to the General Faculty as additional documentation to submit to the selection committee. The call for Faculty Trustee nominations to be sent today.
   • There are many opportunities to refer students to some extracurricular activities sponsored by Student Affairs, and different faculty and student groups: Hispanic Heritage Month, Domestic Violence Awareness Month, Drag Bingo, etc. The Be Brown & Be Proud: The Politics of Ethnic Terminology in the Latinx Community presentation will be held virtually, October 9, and the Organization of Women Leaders (OWLs) has a speaking event, The 19th Amendment, on October 7.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   M. Rees moved to approve the September 29, 2020 Minutes. C. Lam seconded. Approved.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   D. Boschini moved to approve the Agenda. B. Street seconded. Approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
i. AAC (R. Gearhart) Referral 2019-2020 # 18 Interdisciplinary Bachelor Degree in Science in Public Health Proposal - nothing new to report. The committee will begin discussing the Ethnic Studies (ES) requirement. The Ethnic Studies (ES) Unit Task Force will be making recommendations to the AAC. The final campus feedback to the CO is due November 2.

ii. AS&SS (C. Lam) 2019-2020 #12 Graduate Student Grievance and Appeals Policy – Reporting Chain – The committee will be reviewing the Graduate Council’s response and their suggested change in the Handbook language and the process.


iv. BPC (B. Street) Referral 2020-2021 #01 Masters of Science in Computer Science – The committee is working with AAC on a joint resolution.

b. Provost Update – V. Harper will be meeting with Deans regarding the Spring 2021 Instructional Plan. They in turn will be reaching out to department chairs to develop it. The EC will see a draft before its final submittal to the CO, due November 6.

c. Searches

i. AVP AA and Dean of Academic Programs – B. Frakes and C. Prado have been appointed as Administrator and Staff representative, respectively. Fulfillment of the faculty positions is underway. No consultant involvement.

ii. NSME Search Committee Dean – A. Sixtos, and L. A. Bishop have been appointed. The elected faculty representatives are M. Rush, K. Szick, J. Bergkamp, and M. Danforth. Dean Rodriguez has been appointed to the Administrator position. Search Consultant cost is approximately $80K.

iii. Library Dean – The Search closes at end of October.

iv. Antelope Valley Dean – The faculty representatives to the committee are pending school elections. The committee will meet in Spring 2021.

v. AVP Faculty Affairs – The search committee is formed and will meet in the Spring. The deadline is January.

vi. K. Krishnan retires at the end of November. An outstanding Interim AVP of Instructional Research from the CO will be in place for 12 months.

vii. AA Pandemic Budget Advisory Task Force (PBTF) – The first meeting went well. The target reduction of the 2021-2022 budget is $1million. V. Harper expressed his gratitude for, and confidence in B. Hartsell and J. Sun to co-chair the task force.

viii. Provost Pandemic Research Group – V. Harper will provide resources to encourage faculty to study the impact of the pandemic on student
learning, wellness, and health. It will be composed of a research core which will be an interdisciplinary core group across schools and include Student Affairs. The goal is to have a group of publications, grants, presentations and creative activities associated with this. It’s particularly important because of our underrepresented student body that we position ourselves as resource to the country as to the impact of the pandemic and distance learning on our student body. The level of support TBD. Communication forthcoming. The Research Group will send out calls for research areas and decide how funds are allocated. J. Millar is so proud to learn how many CSUB faculty members have already begun the research.

d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – The Pandemic Budget Advisory Task Force (PBTF) met. M. Rees, D. Boschini, and B. Street attended. $1million will need to be cut from the budget and it’s going to hurt. There are many things to consider. Budgets from the last two years have been submitted for the task force’s review. B. Street said the group is thinking about identifying principles and values for guidance. They agree that everything is on the table. Thought $1M is a lot, it may not be sufficient given the economic forecast. This year CSUB had the cushion of reserves. The campus needs to be aware that it’s likely that more funds will be cut. D. Boschini said that there was a lot of different viewpoints at different levels. At the campus level, there will be a variety of people and those looking at this for the first time. The data will be helpful. It’s important for the people involved to share their rationale behind their point of view. For example, the Nursing Department has 35 part-timers. They are doing the Nursing Department a favor by teaching at a fraction of the cost of what their profession provides for their time. Nursing would rather use 3 full-time faculty members and 15 part-timers. The department would probably save money on benefits. Yet they would like to consider reducing the number of part-timers. There will be differences in the right thing to do. This is why it’s important to keep everything on the table to see that what is right for one part of campus may not be the right thing for another part of campus. People tend to advocate for their own area, but the task force is not supposed to do that. R. Gearhart agreed that $1million cut is the best-case scenario. Things are a lot worse than they appear. People who have lost their jobs permanently don’t show up in the unemployment numbers. A. Hegde predicted that 2021 will probably be the worst year in 20 years. B. Street said that the guiding principles of the GI 2025 relates to the graduation rate and it still holds true to fulfill those
commitments. A. Hegde said that the PBTF meets every Friday. The EC will be updated regularly.

e. Ethnic Studies Unit Implementation Taskforce – Some campuses don’t have ES courses yet. Refer to the FAQs website. The Chair of the ASCSU, R. Collins, is willing to attend any Ethnic Studies Unit Implementation Task Force meeting. R. Gearhart received a series of emails from AACSs from other campuses. The GE structures in the CSU are so different and it’s difficult to help each other. Many people are overworked, distressed, and displeased with the process. CSUB can move courses into Area F and meet learning objectives. Some department have GE Modifications (GEMs). Example: Nursing. The Provost’s Office will update the list of GEMs. The rest is up to GECCo to approve the other courses. A. Hegde will ask T. Salisbury to participate as the ES faculty member on the task force.

f. 50th Anniversary – A. Hegde has a meeting with the President later this month when he will offer a debrief from the faculty point of view. There were many Kern Economic Community members and students featured. Not enough faculty members were acknowledged. He spoke to retired faculty who were disappointed about that. J. Millar was glad to hear keynote speaker R. Branson speak to climate change, the need to take care of each other, and that he and K. McCarthy can disagree yet still have a dialogue. It did feel like a birthday party. R. Gearhart said the campus raised $124,000 from 527 individuals. $50,000 of that was from the President. It would be interesting to see the breakdown of faculty, alumni, community supporters, etc. to see how effective the outreach was to different groups. D. Boschini said that she enjoyed Sir R. Branson and there were parts of the event that were really lovely. Her impression was that staff came across as celebrating people who support the campus financially and that the people who do the daily work were missing. It was University Advancement (UA)-centric. UA’s world is with donors. A. Hegde suggested that faculty take ownership of increasing visibility of faculty’s contribution. He shared that we still have a few former Senate Chairs on campus. We can start highlighting the immediately past Chair. We can take a few minutes acknowledging people who were here before and those who have served a long time. Example: 50 years of the Senate. Then go through the faculty who have contributed over time. He was invited to the planning of the 50th Anniversary after much had already been done. Maybe it was in response to the feedback given. D. Boschini said that there is a gap in the faculty communication. Faculty has the power to celebrate. Perhaps faculty is waiting for others to do the job. Reaching out to the Senate Chair perspective is the right way to go. She said that A. Hegde is doing a good job. B. Street agreed with starting the share of Senate
Chairs. Further, it’s an opportunity and a sign of good will to show our support of UA. A. Hegde said we could acknowledge faculty by having the last page of the agenda feature someone who has served on the Senate: D. Boschini, BJ Moore, J. Stark and J. Kegley, J. Deegan, V. Kohli. Then feature people who have helped built the university. Some of the founders of the Economics Department are still here. J. Millar suggested featuring the Wang Award recipients. M. Rees suggested posting a list of past Academic Senate Chairs on the Senate website.

6. **NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS**
   a. Post-Tenure Review Requirements – It concerns standards and expectations. FAC can take this up later and perhaps over email.
   b. FYS Instructors and GECCo structure - This pertains to faculty not associated with any department and how they are reviewed. Many instructors teaching the First Year Student (FYS) course are staff members. Consider changes to the manual. It needs to be part of the GECCo and overall governance discussion. Carry-over to the next meeting.
   c. Academic Petitions Manual (APM) Proposal – GECCo proposed a change. It seems to be an AAC issue. M. Danforth requested a slightly longer conversation about GECCo before referring to the sub-committee. Look at oversight and how GECCo reports to the Senate. Changing the APM needs to be part of the longer conversation. A. Gebauer’s document of proposed changes will be available at the next meeting.
   d. Unapproved Software – B. Hartsell sent a notice that some faculty are using non-Zoom videoconference and other software not approved. M. Danforth said it’s an unrealistic expectation that people would limit to approved software because there are a lot of free software available. It is an ITS procurement process issue. Faculty requiring students to buy things that are not part of the adopted course materials submitted bookstore is being conflated with the software issue. It would be referred to AS&SS if it’s about software. A. Hegde said table the topic for now.
   e. Expanded Winter Session (handout) M. Novak wants Extended Education and Global Outreach (EEGO) courses to start at the end of the Fall exam schedule. Part of the rationale is that it allows more time for reading in Humanities courses. A survey of 20 campus showed that 10 have the extended winter session. R. Gearhart said it’s going to be a pandemic Christmas. This will be the height of the flu season. Students will need a break. M. Danforth said it’s a BPC issue to change the calendar. There is a concern that faculty will be supervising classes and not on faculty time. That is creating faculty workload creep. C. Lam
is in favor of an expanded Winter Session as most students and faculty are willing to do it. B. Street said it would not be in effect until Winter December 2021. A. Hegde said we have priorities and deadlines, like ES and other programs to be approved. M. Rees said that it doesn’t hurt to send it out and get other voices. If it’s for 2021 we need to start on it now. A. Hegde referred it to AAC. If AAC doesn’t feel it’s worthwhile then BPC won’t have to get involved. B. Street is happy for it to come to BPC whereby R. Gearhart AAC will take the lead. J. Millar asked if this something to entertain since it’s a workload issue and we need to find a $1 million to cut. A. Hegde said it may be discussed at the PBTF. How much money is EEGO making? Decisions are faculty driven. The curriculum is our purview and role to decide. It will be based on what is good for the students. The issue was referred to AAC and BPC.

R. Gearhart and D. Boschini extend the meeting by 10 minutes.

f. Course Repetition – R. Gearhart said that more data needed before we can consider repeats three or four times. It’s a money grab to get a few more semesters out of students before they fail out. M. Danforth said that the data submitted was from the Academic Petitions Committee. It neglects that departments and faculty advisors may have rejected repetitions before the request even gets to Academic Petitions Committee. The Computer and Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Department has a Department Petition Process. There is a form on their website that if a student wants to repeat a course for the fourth time, the student must have the Department approval before it’s sent to the Academic Petitions Committee. The department approval rate is less than 25%. Thus, Academic Petitions Committee is only seeing the ones that ECE and CS faculty have supported after a number of attempts. She is concerned about adding a policy on this. Already, after 1.5 years of not making progress on their degree, and if we can take it off and waste their repeat units on one class, what is it really doing to help students? How does this meet the students where they are? They may need to be directed to a more practical pathway. A. Hegde said that potentially they are racking up student loan debt without making any progress. The issued was referred to AS&SS and AAC.

g. Elections and Appointments (deferred)
   i. School Elections Committees
   ii. Committee proliferation

h. Handbook 306.2.2.e - Make item a. on next EC Agenda.
7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING OCTOBER 15, 2020** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   - Announcements
   - President Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10)
   - Consent Agenda
   - Reports
   - New Business
   - RES Masters in Computer Sciences
   - Old Business
   - Open Forum and Wellness Check

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**
   Next week extra EC meeting. Would it serve will of committee instead of Senate meeting have a second sub-committee meeting? J. Millar supports changing Senate Oct 15 to another standing committee meeting. C. Lam said that if the committee passes the catalog language change before the deadline, we are fine. A. Hegde said that the AAC is waiting on information from the Grad Council.
   No extra EC meeting next meeting, as of this time.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**
   A. Hegde adjourned the meeting at 11:45.
1. CALL TO ORDER
   A. Hegde called the meeting to order.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK
   - Assistant Vice Chancellors (AVC) A. Wrynn and L. Van Cleve – A. Hegde posed some questions. A. Wrynn started with short PowerPoint to help answer the questions and process that that lie between 1) AB 1460 the law and 2) how Ethnic Studies (ES) becomes CSU policy, 3) Why in GE, 4) Rational for Timeline, and 5) Faculty impact and involvement. The California Community College (CCC) transfer courses for CSU GE credit are centrally approved. They have a February deadline to submit their classes for approval, per A. Wrynn. Courses are reviewed based on core competencies, learning outcomes and an ES prefix. M. Martinez asked if students could satisfy ES requirement through CCC courses. Wrynn replied, “yes”. M. Danforth asked about 2.2.5 subitem D where it strikes authority for campus to make adjustments. Her concern is that some may try to eliminate upper division major course double-counting and other adjustments used at CSUB to free GE units for CSUB-specific GE areas. For example, Upper Division B is met through a STEM course for STEM majors. A. Wrynn replied that upper division campus based requirements okay as long as stay within 120 units to graduate. We have six areas with prescribed area of units. M. Danforth is concerned by taking out campus autonomy it may limit flexibility and creativity. The change to Area C took away flexibility for courses in the sub areas and is not related to the ES implementation. The proposed wording does not interplay well with the option to fold American Institutions – US History into Area C. Does US History take the proposed “student-choice” slot or the Humanities slot? Label it C-3 and call it US History? A. Wrynn will follow up on campus autonomy. Some things were shifted during the change. She doesn’t think that Computer & Electrical Engineering and Computer Science will have trouble. Be sure to include concerns and recommendations in the campus’
written response. A. Wrynn will check with D. Jackson too. M. Rees also had similar concerns about the proposed wording changes to Area C. A. Wrynn said one can suggest language. The CO will listen. If it needs to be specifically in the policy, send the language along. M. Rees asked about Area F Departments. A. Wrynn replied that the rationale shall be met only by a specific list of departments (African American, Asian American, Latina/o American or Native American Studies) in the findings and declaration and not in the education code. The ES Council said it should come from one of the four departments. The approved cross list is a compromise. If campus wants another level of approval, forming an ES Council is OK. The courses don’t have to be interdisciplinary. There are many classes that can be met from other departments – Art, Sociology, etc. M. Danforth asked if the policy will also list a more generic ES department to approve, (reference page 9). A. Wrynn replied that the updated version of demonstrates flexibility in the naming of departments. Example Ethic Studies, Native American, aka Indigenous People of the Americas, etc. A. Wrynn appreciates that this is extra work. A. Hegde thanked A. Wrynn and L. Van Cleve for being responsive. M. Martinez asked for written confirmation that CCC courses can satisfy the ES requirement. It will help our transfer students. She will revise power point before she sends to A. Hegde.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   October 6, 2020 Minutes (deferred)

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   Approved by advance agreement that the sole purpose of the meeting was to meet with the AVCs to discuss Feedback on CSU GE EO.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS (deferred)
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (R. Gearhart)
      ii. AS&SS (C. Lam)
      iii. FAC (M. Rees)
      iv. BPC (B. Street)
   b. Provost Update
   c. Searches
   d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation - PBTF
   e. Ethnic Studies Unit Implementation Task Force

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
a. Feedback on CSU GE EO – Ethnic Studies (handout)

D. Boschini said the slide presentation from AVC A. Wrynn was helpful. Keep in mind that an overlay is off the table. Make it clear in every conversation that overlay of courses is off the table. If a new person comes into the conversation, get the points of clarity out front so the conversation doesn’t have to start all over again. If we pause to consider one more thing, we go down the rabbit hole. The horse is so far out of the barn that we can’t go back. M. Rees read the opposition from other campus. Is there a sense that we need to join? A. Hegde replied that there are four campuses with controversy. Half objected to the deadline being too soon. The other two campuses charge that there is faculty conflict with the Senate Task Force. The Senate Chairs of those campuses said that it’s the sentiment of enough faculty that they had to show that there is conflict. The law doesn’t say that it has to be lower division GE or Area F. A. Hegde doesn’t advocate for conflict. It’s the law to meet requirement of ES before graduation. Hear everyone out and do the best we can. The CSU has a deadline to submit results to legislature. D. Boschini supports J. Millar’s point about the potential of a lot of conflict and her suggestion to bring someone in to mediate the beginning of the conversation and set norms. R. Gearhart suggested to invite ASCSU Chair, R. Collins to have that role. A. Hegde replied that learning outcomes and unit implementation were separated to avoid conflict. The AVC’s presentation veered towards the technicality of the core competencies and who is ES faculty. It is a completely different conversation than the three units requirement. He didn’t see any objection to Area F coming from reducing Area D. He spoke with Psychology. There are two main programs that will be impacted. Right now, we don’t have the resources to meet all the GE. Students will take three less units in Area D. It may require some GE Modifications. GECCo’s task force and the departments can propose some modifications. A. Hegde offered to moderate so we don’t have to hire a consultant. Although he could talk to Provost to see if we can hire one. A. Hegde will also ask R. Collins if he’s willing to moderate. R. Gearhart: every week AA chairs meet. The law is still in flux. Their focus is first on unit implementation and then worry later who and what courses apply. C. Lam was involved in the design of the current semester GE and GECCo. The reason for the current structure is to prevent silos and lack of communication between areas. There is no coherence with the GE program. We need to address that part. V. Harper has a lot of faith because we have talked about EO 1100, we reduced remediation, and we went through the Quarter to Semester conversion. Faculty has more than overcome obstacles; they have optimally implemented change.
There are some related issues that can be resolved through governance. During the ES Task Force meeting, the group concluded that they will take care of unit implementation and make recommendations. V. Harper has assured faculty that he is supportive of who teaches the courses and that the teaching is reflected of the diversity. Let us check the box for unit implementation, and then we will engage in the long term and work on GECCo. M. Danforth suggested bringing a 3rd party outside of EC so there really is neutrality. Look for a volunteer to avoid any conflict-of-interest. It may be better received if there is someone outside the ASCSU and CSUB Academic Senate structure. To C. Lam’s comment to prevent silos, it was probably directed toward the interdisciplinary parts of GE, Area A and Area E. The discipline-specific areas of GE need more subject matter experts brought into the process. A. Hegde said we can get someone from outside, yet the feedback has to go through the Academic Senate anyway. Further, no one else has invested as much time in finding out about AB 1460. This process is for those of us here. There will be some debate, and we shouldn’t be afraid of that. It’s healthy. The university has faith in individuals to resolve those things. If we bring someone in, it sends the wrong message that we expect problems. We anticipated that the learning outcomes would be somewhat controversial. That’s why forming an ES Council, or a Curriculum Committee was suggested. There would be subject matter experts on board and if the Curriculum Committee says “no”, there has to be some recourse for appeal, which will come at a later date. Now, focus on unit implementation and create an Area F. He is not on the ES Task Force. Whatever comes from Task Force will go through EC. M. Martinez suggested for the members to contemplate including the ES Councils at Taft College and Bakersfield College. A. Hegde agreed the language isn’t from non-experts dictating what can or cannot be in a course. Example: Kinesiology doesn’t tell Political Science what should go in a Government class. There are other faculty with ES expertise, such as I. Cargile, who can determine whether faculty is certified or not. The presumption is that faculty chairs will choose who is qualified to teach. As ASCSU chair R. Collins said at the last CSUB ES Unit Implementation Task Force meeting, Computer Science could offer a course that has 50% coding and the other 50% meet the ES learning outcomes. There is a lot of common ground. Have faith in our colleagues. It’s for our students. R. Gearhart said there are three things he’d like the ES Unit Implementation Task Force to approve/not approve at the meeting tomorrow: 1) GEMs become the domain of the departments, 2) reduction from 6 to 3 units in Area D, and 3) Creation of Area F that houses lower division ES courses with current ES courses migrating from C to F. Who
teaches cross-listed courses or the course approval process is to-be-determined. A. Hegde encourages members to be mindful of having a discussion that moves things forward. M. Danforth will miss the ES meeting as she teaches at that time. She asked that someone reach out to Liberal Studies and Engineering Sciences about how Area D unit reduction would affect them. There is a Nursing professor on the Unit Implementation Task Force. Those majors are impacted. A. Sawyer of Liberal Studies and L. Cabrales of Engineering Sciences will be contacted. N. Michieka will address Economics. M. Danforth said we have to make sure that the programs are not caught between two state laws. Everything else is a local decision. V. Harper said that the deadline to submit feedback to the CO is November 2.

b. Provost Pandemic Research Group (deferred)

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING OCTOBER 15, 2020** (deferred)
   
   **Announcements**
   
   President Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10)
   
   University Police Update – M. Williamson (Time Certain 10:30)
   
   **Consent Agenda**
   
   **Reports**
   
   **New Business**
   
   **Old Business**
   
   **Open Forum and Wellness Check**

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

   ES Council helps to fill the gap where there aren’t any ES faculty on GECCo. For example, if another department wanted to start a course, the ES Council could approve for cross listing. J. Moraga and T. Salisbury would be members, as well as others who are not ES faculty, yet they have experience. R. Gearhart learned that SF State is looking at courses if 50% includes the learning outcomes. M. Danforth said that GECCo is a relatively new structure, and previously there was more control by the discipline experts on what constitutes an Area C class, etc. For example, NSME Curriculum Committee used to have control over Area B. GECCo has proposed changes to Area B but NSME Curriculum Committee has rejected those changes. We need to return control to the subject matter experts. There are disciplines that are Area-specific. A. Hegde agrees. It’s not conducive to shared learning. We’ll get something in place to take care of the law. Then in the spring we’ll take apart the structure and rebuild.
V. Harper is in favor of building a small committee to meet deadline. We had two weeks to form a committee to provide feedback on EO 1000. The campus’ response was “Other”.

M. Martinez agreed with everything M. Danforth said. There is not systemic racism in the group, yet there are issues. Any perceived activism is not a good thing. Going from enthusiasm to activism is crossing the line. Ensure that we’re not crossing that line.

J. Millar is in support of an ES Council. She encouraged use of the CO’s Council of ES to walk us through the conflicts/ideas. An Asian Studies professor teaching in History may be considered a fellow to provide feedback. Assemblywoman Weber has ES background and her legislation is based on the Council of ES. It’s about people, races, and intersectionality.

9. ADJOURNMENT
A. Hegde thanked the members for attending the extra EC meeting to address the feedback on the EO GE Ethnic Studies. He adjourned the meeting at 11:45.
# Academic Affairs Committee: Richard Gearhart/Chair, meets 10:00am via Zoom

**Dates:** Sept 10, Sept 24, Oct 8, Oct 22, Nov 5, Nov 19, Dec 10, Jan 28, Feb 11, Feb 25, Mar 11, Mar 25, Apr 8, Apr 22, May 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/1/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 16 Program Review Process Improvement</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td>Streamline the process upon looking at minimum federal requirements and the current Academic Program Review template. <strong>Addendum:</strong> Review UPRC Annual Report dated May 2020, define the purpose of the program review, clarify what Academic Programs can and cannot request, streamline the program template to one page, make the people and the process consistent with the Handbook, timely completion of self-study to effect student learning outcomes, offer assessment training workshops, and compensation for assessment coordinators.</td>
<td>AAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 18 Interdisciplinary BS Degree in Public Health Proposal</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td>The demand, structure, and resources required to deliver effectively and efficiently. Returned to proposers with comments on what needs to be improved. Do the courses have a home and would the Curriculum Committees approve before it comes back to AAC.</td>
<td>AAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 18 Interdisciplinary BS Degree in Public Health Proposal</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td>AAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 01 Master of Science in Computer Science</td>
<td>Second Reading 10/29/20</td>
<td>AAC BPC Program rationale, existing resources, additional resources required. RES 202108 Proposal for Master of Science in Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 09 Expanded Winter Session</td>
<td>AAC BPC</td>
<td>Examine whether or not the current CSUB Winter Session, based on the calendar, is a sufficient instructional period, faculty workload issues, and impact on student financial aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 10 Course Repetition</td>
<td>AAC AS&amp;SS</td>
<td>Examine relevance of data from the Academic Petitions Committee and whether policy is needed for how many times a student can repeat an individual course for forgiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Academic Support and Student Services: Charles Lam /Chair, meets 10:00 via Zoom video conference

**Dates:** Sept 10, Sept 24, Oct 8, Oct 22, Nov 5, Nov 19, Dec 10, Jan 28, Feb 11, Feb 25, Mar 11, Mar 25, Apr 8, Apr 22, May 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/10/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 12– Graduate Student Grievance and Appeals Policy – Reporting Chain</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td>AS&amp;SS Policy alignment: University Handbook, and Catalog The committee is waiting for the graduate policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 10 Course Repetition</td>
<td></td>
<td>AAC, AS&amp;SS Examine efficacy of data from the Academic Petitions Committee and whether policy is needed for how many times a student can repeat an individual course for forgiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 10 Course Repetition</td>
<td></td>
<td>AAC AS&amp;SS Examine relevance of data from the Academic Petitions Committee and whether policy is needed for how many times a student can repeat an individual course for forgiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/27/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 08 Honorary Doctorate-Handbook Change</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td>FAC Refer to RES 121329 Procedures for Honorary Doctorate Nominations and Selection REVISED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 02 Criteria and Nomination Process for Faculty Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC Define meritorious, pressure from senior faculty, confidentiality of process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 04 Office Hours Policy</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>FAC Clarify the language in Handbook 303.1.3, How to hold office hours via videoconference, Censure or penalty for missing office hours. RES 202106 Office Hours Policy During Mandated Remote Delivery</td>
<td>09/17/20</td>
<td>09/25/20</td>
<td>10/01/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 05 CFA President or Designee on FAC-Bylaws Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC The CFA President’s knowledge of existing contracts, and emerging issues at the campus and system levels. Whether the position is voting or ex-officio member RES 202107 CFA President or Designee on FAC – Bylaws Change</td>
<td>10/01/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 07 Fall Classroom Observations</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>FAC Decision needs to be made before second year of RTP files on whether to have mandatory observation and the option to include in RTP, etc. RES 202105 Fall Classroom Observations During Mandatory Remote Delivery</td>
<td>09/17/20</td>
<td>09/25/20</td>
<td>10/01/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/08/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 08 Notification to Chairs of Assigned Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC Specifying the appropriate timing and notification to the department chair and how the coordination with AA and HR can improve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Budget and Planning Committee: Brian Street/Chair, meets 10:00am via Zoom video conference

**Dates:**  Sept 10, Sept 24, Oct 8, Oct 22, Nov 5, Nov 19, Dec 10, Jan 28, Feb 11, Feb 25, Mar 11, Mar 25, Apr 8, Apr 22, May 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 01 Master of Science in Computer Science</td>
<td>Second Reading 10/29/20</td>
<td>AAC BPC Program rationale, existing resources, additional resources required. RES 202108 Proposal for Master of Science in Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 03 Institutional Research in Response to WSCUC Report</td>
<td></td>
<td>BPC Feedback from CO, access and permissions to data, what faculty needs, what data department chairs’ need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 09 Expanded Winter Session</td>
<td></td>
<td>AAC BPC Examine whether or not the current CSUB Winter Session, based on the calendar, is a sufficient instructional period, faculty workload issues, and impact on student financial aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would like to respond to your email and questions here and Dr. Sumaya can correct me or add to this:

The executive committee had some questions/seeking clarifications. Some refer to this document (which may need to be updated)
https://www.csub.edu/senate/_files/elections_appointments/IRB%20HSR.pdf. Pardon our ignorance, if these are obvious questions.

1. Is the above document correct? No, see attached document.
2. Could you please provide a brief description of the different sub-committees (scientific concerns, etc)? See attached
3. Some members noted that Isabel is in two different positions (Alternate for Scientific Concerns and Alternate), with different term ends (Dec 2020 and Jan 2020) – assuming the above document is correct. For which position is the reappointment being sought? She should only be listed as an alternate for Scientific Concerns, see attached.
4. Finally, is that something that requires a campus-wide call. i.e is this a second 3-yr term (which may not need a call, or a third term, which may need a call)? I am unable to find language that includes "campus-wide call". See attached authoritative references.

Gwen Parnell, B.A., CIP
Research Compliance Analyst

Office of Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs
California State University, Bakersfield
Office: DDH D108  Mail Stop: 24DDH
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, CA 93311
gparnell@csub.edu
Phone: 661-654-2231
Fax: 661-654-3342
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Contact Number</th>
<th>Date Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Commuri</td>
<td>Chandra</td>
<td>Chair, HSIRB (Scientific Concerns)</td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>x 6140</td>
<td>12/1/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Herndon</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>HSIRB (Community Concerns)</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Cell: 661-331-3718</td>
<td>12/31/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>HSIRB (Non-Scientific Concerns)</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>x 3253</td>
<td>1/30/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Olson</td>
<td>Nate</td>
<td>HSIRB (Non-Scientific Concerns)</td>
<td>Phil/Religious Studies</td>
<td>x 2314</td>
<td>6/30/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>HSIRB (Non-Scientific Concerns)</td>
<td>DPEL Program Director</td>
<td>x 2323</td>
<td>5/1/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tunson</td>
<td>Tommy</td>
<td>HSIRB (Community Concerns)</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>661-717-4362</td>
<td>10/31/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>HSIRB (Scientific Concerns)</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>x 3502</td>
<td>9/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Marianne</td>
<td>HSIRB (Scientific Concerns)</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>x 2075</td>
<td>8/31/2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternates:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>McGauley</th>
<th>Colleen</th>
<th>HSIRB (Alternate)</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th></th>
<th>1/30/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sumaya</td>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>HSIRB (Alternate)</td>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>x 2381</td>
<td>1/30/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
303.9.2 Membership of the IRB/HSR

In compliance with federal regulations, the IRB/HSR’s membership consists of nine (9) persons. Three (3) shall be CSUB faculty whose primary concern is nonscientific; three (3) shall be CSUB faculty whose primary concern is scientific; and three (3) shall be community members not affiliated with CSUB.

In consultation with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and the Assistant Vice-President for Grants, Research and Sponsored Programs (GRASP), the P&VPAA selects and appoints the chair and IRB/HSR members to three-year terms. In consultation with the IRB/HSR chair, the P&VPAA may also remove members who do not participate in IRB/HSR activities.

The Assistant Vice-President for Grants, Research and Sponsored Programs (GRASP) provides administrative support for the IRB/HSR.

Members of the IRB/HSR may not participate in the review of any project in which the member has an interest.

CSUB IRB Policies and Procedures

The Committee Members

1. In consultation with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and the Assistant Vice-President for Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall select and appoint all the committee members of the CSUB IRB/HSR, in accord with the diversity principles specified above. 2. The nominal length of service shall be three (3) academic years. By mutual agreement, committee members may be appointed to additional three-year terms. 3. To ensure continuity of "committee history," appointments for the first year shall be staggered, i.e., one-, two-, and three-year terms. Thereafter, all terms shall be three (3) years. By mutual agreement, a committee member completing a one- or two-year term may be appointed to a full three-year term.

Department of Health and Human Services Office for Human Research Protections, 45 CFR 46

§46.107  IRB membership.

(a) Each IRB shall have at least five members, with varying backgrounds to promote complete and adequate review of research activities commonly conducted by the institution. The IRB shall be sufficiently qualified through the experience and expertise of its members (professional competence), and the diversity of its members, including race, gender, and cultural backgrounds and sensitivity to such issues as community attitudes, to promote respect for its advice and counsel in safeguarding the rights and welfare of human subjects. The IRB shall be able to ascertain the acceptability of proposed research in terms of institutional commitments (including policies and resources) and regulations, applicable law, and standards of professional conduct and practice. The IRB shall therefore include persons knowledgeable in these areas. If an IRB regularly reviews research that involves a category of subjects that is vulnerable to coercion or undue influence, such as children, prisoners, individuals with impaired decision-making capacity, or economically or educationally disadvantaged persons, consideration shall be given
to the inclusion of one or more individuals who are knowledgeable about and experienced in working with these categories of subjects.

(b) Each IRB shall include at least one member whose primary concerns are in scientific areas and at least one member whose primary concerns are in nonscientific areas.

(c) Each IRB shall include at least one member who is not otherwise affiliated with the institution and who is not part of the immediate family of a person who is affiliated with the institution.

(d) No IRB may have a member participate in the IRB’s initial or continuing review of any project in which the member has a conflicting interest, except to provide information requested by the IRB.

(e) An IRB may, in its discretion, invite individuals with competence in special areas to assist in the review of issues that require expertise beyond or in addition to that available on the IRB. These individuals may not vote with the IRB.
DATE: October 9, 2020

TO: Aaron Hedge, Chair, Academic Senate

cc: Vernon Harper, Interim Provost & Vice-President, Academic Affairs
    Leslie Williams, Secretary to the Provost
    Beth Bywaters, Academic Senate, Administrative Support Coordinator
    Imeh Ebong, AVP for Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs
    Isabel Sumaya, Practicing Scientist, Department of Psychology
    Gwen Parnell, Research Compliance Analyst, IRB Logistical Support

FROM: Matt Leon, Chair, IACUC

SUBJECT: Recommendation for IACUC Re-appointment as Alternate Member

This memo is to recommend re-appointment of Dr. Isabel Sumaya, Professor, Department of Psychology, to the CSUB Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee [IACUC]. Isabel has agreed to continue to serve. Her re-appointment should be for a term of three years effective August 31, 2020 and conclude August 31, 2023.

If the Academic Senate is in agreement with the re-appointment, please forward her nomination to the Academic Provost with an expression of your support. Upon agreement of the recommendation, please let me know when the Academic Senate has advised the Provost's Office. Thank you.

Isabel’s contact information is below:

(661) 654-2381
isumaya@csub.edu

DDH H108 (Mail Stop: 24DDH)
DATE: 8 October 2020

TO: Aaron Hegde, Chair, Academic Senate

cc: Tommy Tunson, Retired Arvin Chief of Police
    Chandra Commuri, HSIRB Chair
    Vernon Harper, Provost & Vice-President, Academic Affairs
    Beth Bywaters, Academic Senate, Administrative Support Coordinator
    Leslie Williams, Secretary to the Provost
    Imeh Ebong, AVP for Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs
    Gwen Parnell, Research Compliance Analyst, IRB Logistical Support

FROM: Dr. Isabel Sumaya, University Research Ethics Review Coordinator

SUBJECT: Recommendation for Re-Appointment

Based on the recommendation of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) and following policy for re-appointment of its members, this memo is to recommend the re-appointment of Tommy Tunson, retired Arvin Chief of Police, as a member of the CSUB HSIRB. Tommy will complete his three-year term as a community member and has agreed to continue serving the board. In following with HSIRB policy, I request that Tommy be appointed to a three-year term to commence on October 31, 2020, expiring on October 31, 2023.

If the Academic Senate is in agreement with the re-appointment, please forward his nomination to the Academic Provost with an expression of your support. Upon agreement of the recommendation, please let me know when the Academic Senate has advised the Provost’s Office. Thank you.

Below is Tommy’s email: tunson81@gmail.com
DATE: 8 October 2020

TO: Aaron Hegde, Chair, Academic Senate

cc: Jessica Williamson, Psychology
Chandra Commuri, HSIRB Chair
Vernon Harper, Provost & Vice-President, Academic Affairs
Beth Bywaters, Academic Senate, Administrative Support Coordinator
Leslie Williams, Secretary to the Provost
Imeh Ebong, AVP for Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs
Gwen Parnell, Research Compliance Analyst, IRB Logistical Support

FROM: Dr. Isabel Sumaya, University Research Ethics Review Coordinator

SUBJECT: Recommendation for Re-Appointment

Based on the recommendation of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) and following policy for re-appointment of its members, this memo is to recommend the re-appointment of Dr. Jessica Williamson, as a member of the CSUB HSIRB. Jessica has just completed her first one-year term as a scientific member and has agreed to continue serving the board. In following with HSIRB policy, I request that Jessica be appointed to a three-year term to commence on September 30, 2020 expiring on September 30, 2023.

If the Academic Senate is in agreement with the re-appointment, please forward her nomination to the Academic Provost with an expression of your support. Upon agreement of the recommendation, please let me know when the Academic Senate has advised the Provost’s Office. Thank you.

Below is Jessica’s email:

jwilliamson12@csub.edu
I suspect the marked section was inadvertently added, rather than having something missing. If you take out the bold, underlined section, it's coherent.

e. Temporary faculty in Groups 1, 3 or 4 shall submit SOCIs in accordance with during the fall semester, prior to the beginning of the evaluation process for the first established departmental policy and for a minimum of two classes for each year taught since their last periodic evaluation. Temporary faculty in Group 1 shall be reviewed during the Spring PEF cycle. Temporary faculty in Group 3 or 4 shall be reviewed yearly during the Spring RTP cycle. (Revised 06-06-17)

Hi, Bruce.

In the version I have (dated July 2, 2018) 306.2.2.e says the following:

e. Temporary faculty in Groups 1, 3 or 4 shall submit SOCIs in accordance with (something is missing here) during the fall semester, prior to the beginning of the evaluation process for the first established departmental policy and for a minimum of two classes for each year taught since their last periodic evaluation. Temporary faculty in Group 1 shall be reviewed during the Spring PEF cycle. Temporary faculty in Group 3 or 4 shall be reviewed yearly during the Spring RTP cycle. (Revised 06-06-17)

I assume what is missing is “department policy”, which may just be an editorial change. Will take it up with EC.

Beth, would you please put this on next week’s EC agenda under the Handbook Error log item?

Thanks,
Aaron

--------------------------------
Dr. S. Aaron Hegde, PhD
Chair, Academic Senate
Chair and Professor, Economics
Director, ERM Program
Aaron and Beth,

306.2.2.e is supposed to say this -- or something darned near like it.

e. Temporary faculty in Groups 1, 3 or 4 shall submit SOCIs in accordance with established departmental policy and for a minimum of two classes for each year taught since their last periodic evaluation. Temporary faculty in Group 1 shall be reviewed during the Spring quarter semester PEF cycle. Temporary faculty in Group 3 or 4 shall be reviewed yearly during the Spring RTP cycle.


Thanks,
Bruce
Hi Aaron,

Can’t the schools just make their own accounts on VotingPlace? They’ll have much smaller populations of voting faculty, so they would probably qualify for the lower pricing tiers. Or perhaps we need to allow other electronic voting means during the pandemic as an interim measure.

With regards to GECCo, my personal frustration is the constantly shifting goal-posts with respects to what a course needs to do in order to be approved. There also doesn’t seem to be sufficient consultation when the student learning outcomes, requirements, etc. are revised. The former is more personal, but the later speaks to a governance / structural issue. And of course, any changes to the GE structure itself needs to clearly be labeled as going through appropriate consultation and that is has Senate oversight.

Melissa

Hi, Melissa.

Thanks for looking in to these issues. You are absolutely correct that it has fallen on Beth to co-ordinate and at times run school elections. This is the reason I had suggested in the summer that you have a meeting with each SEC chair and discuss their charge and responsibilities. We can step if there are any disputes that need an impartial arbitrator. The handbook is not very detailed about the process within each school. Perhaps you can ask each SEC chair to have by-laws and get them approved from the school faculty. Finally, we had stayed away from allowing SECs use Voting Place to run their elections, since it would fall on Beth to do it, as the only authorized administrator. The three of us can certainly discuss if we should make an exception during virtual delivery.

We do need to revisit GECCo structure. Before we send it out to committee, I wanted to get some more background about the central issues that need fixing. Is it just a reporting mechanism that needs to change, or are there more deeper issues/concerns. I am aware of those issues raised by some chairs in DCLC. I want to know if they are still of concern or if they have been fixed. Vernon had apparently passed along the message to Lori requesting her to address them. I was thinking of putting it as an item on the next DCLC meeting, getting some feedback, and then sending it to committee. We can certainly discuss it further at EC.

Beth, would you please amend the item on the agenda to say “FYS Instructors and GECCo
structure”?

Thanks,
Aaron

---------------------------------------------
Dr. S. Aaron Hegde, Ph.D.
Chair, Academic Senate
Chair and Professor, Economics
Director, ERM Program
CSUB
9001 Stockdale Hwy
Bakersfield, CA 93311
s hegde@csub.edu

From: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>
Date: Sunday, August 30, 2020 at 8:24 PM
To: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>
Cc: Beth Bywaters <ebywaters@csub.edu>
Subject: Possible Handbook / process changes

Hi Aaron,

Beth noticed at the end of the week that three of the four School Elections Committees had not run the elections for replacing termed-out members. I’ve also been having a lot of questions on the elections process, so I had a conversation with Beth and I’ve been reading up on that part of the Handbook this weekend. After all of that, I’m seeing a couple of issues, both procedural and Handbook related.

The first issue is the delineation of the duties to each SEC. The Handbook elections section reads to me like a distributed system managed and overseen by the Senate, with each SEC taking a stronger role within their school for school-based calls and elections, then reporting up to Senate regularly of nominations and outcomes. But it seems to be running in a more centralized mode, with the Senate office doing almost everything. As the campus grows, a centralized model is not going to scale. My computer science background is constantly thinking about scaling, so this leaps out at me. This is probably more procedural than Handbook-related, but something that needs to be ironed out before we get more issues as the campus grows.

More immediately related to the SEC, the SEC chair and/or the dean’s office staff should have been making sure that all the seats on each SEC are replaced as terms expire, particularly since those seats will always be school seats and will never turn into at-large seats. I think the Handbook is pretty clear here “The composition and structure of the SEC is decided by the faculty of the School”, which I would think also means each school has to run the SEC elections since they determine the composition. But given that three out of the four haven’t done that yet, perhaps we need to revise
that Handbook line to also make it clear that each school is responsible for electing people to their SEC, following the election rules in the Handbook, and for informing the Senate office of the outcomes.

Maybe I’m overthinking things and the SEC issue is as simple as they don’t know how to run an electronic vote now that we’re working remotely and we just need to provide some training on VotingPlace to the deans’ ASCs. But I suspect there’s also some procedural and Handbook issues at play.

Second, this deep dive into elections sparked a neuron that the Senate has discussed in the past, before the pandemic, concerns about committee proliferation from a faculty workload perspective. It was set aside for very valid reasons, but now that we’ll be in remote operation for a while, Exec Committee may want to circle back to this issue again. Committee proliferation is a workload issue from several perspectives.

Third, it also sparked a neuron that we were going to have broader discussions about GECCo structure and governance this Fall, but it wasn’t on the Exec Committee agenda, other than the part about FYS instructors. But there were concerns in Spring about Senate oversight of GECCo and other GECCo-related concerns. I can’t recall how CARS operated before GECCo, other than that it delegated responsibility for Area B GE courses to the NSME Curriculum Committee. Charles was on CARS though, so he can provide more insight there.

Melissa

--
Dr. Melissa Danforth
Vice Chair, CSUB Academic Senate
Professor, Department Chair
Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering/Computer Science
California State University, Bakersfield
Office: Sci III 319
Phone: (661) 654-3180
Website: https://www.cs.csub.edu/~melissa/
Fall Call for Interest to be Appointed to Various Universitywide Committees

Please provide a brief description of why you are interested and how you have suitable background for your selected committee(s).

ALL UNIVERSITY TEACHER EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TEAC)

The University-Wide Teacher Education Advisory Committee, which is chaired by the P&VPAA, is charged with the responsibility to review all components of teacher preparation and to recommend policy and actions regarding these matters. Its recommendations for new programs and modifications to extent ones are reviewed by the Academic Senate and approved by the President before submission to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Faculty members are appointed by the Senate Executive Committee to serve two-year staggered terms upon recommendation by the Vice President of Academic Affairs. Handbook 201.5

(2) NSM&E Full-Time Faculty Members to serve a two-year term, May 2020-May 2022

Audrey Kemp – Ph.D. Assistant Professor, Mathematics

I believe I would be an excellent candidate to be appointed to the Teacher Education Advisory Committee for the May 2020 - May 2022 term. I am currently on TEAC completing a two-year term and have developed an understanding for the goals and purpose of the committee. I have made contacts within the committee and with members of the community (for example, within KHSD) to lay the groundwork for making sure our students are adequately prepared and equipped with everything they need to be successful once they graduate. I am also getting more involved with the Mathematics and Science Teacher Initiative (MSTI), which would complement my appointment on TEAC well. As one of my passions is conducting research on improving the understanding of and preparing pre-service math teachers, I am confident that I can continue to contribute meaningfully to the mission of this committee.

Thank you for your consideration, Aubrey Kemp

David Sandles, Ed.D.

I would really relish the opportunity. My qualifications are as follows:

I am a 19-year veteran of K-12 teaching with 7 seven years of experience serving as a teacher educator in both National University and CSU Bakersfield’s respective teacher education programs. As a graduate of CSUB and the current coordinator of CSUB’s masters in Curriculum and Instruction, I am passionate about developing new educators and programming that supports students in both K-12 and higher education sectors. Further, I am a former teacher of the year (2009), who holds CA Multiple Subjects and CA Reading Specialist credentials.

UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC PLANNING & BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE (USP & BAC)

The University Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee monitors progress towards the achievement of the University’s goals and objectives, including the review of institutional metrics and data, and provides input on the budgetary strategy to support the plan. The Committee advises the President on campus budget matters and makes recommendations for supporting the academic mission and maintaining institutional viability in light of fiscal challenges and opportunities. Faculty members are selected by President in consultation with chairs of AS Exec Committee to serve two-year term.

(1) Alternate Full-Time Faculty Representative to serve a two-year term, May 2020-May 2022
John Tarjan Chair, Management/Marketing
I would be interested in serving as the alternate on the USP&BAC. Thanks. JT
- I have a great deal of interest in budgetary and strategic planning matters.
- Completed accounting courses through first semester intermediate.
- Completed a finance concentration in my master’s degree.
- Serve on the Pandemic Budget Task force.
- Served on the CSUB Faculty Budget Prioritization Task Force
- Served on systemwide budget committees.
- Served years on the ASCSU Fiscal & Governmental Affairs Committee.
- Served on USP&BAC in the past.
- Served on several CSUB strategic planning committees, subcommittees, and task forces.
- Serve on the Goal 1 Committee.
- Participated in Access to Excellence (fairly significant roles) and Cornerstones.
- Have conducted numerous budget analyses using CSUB Tableau and other databases.
- Am familiar with CA state and CSU system budget practices.
- Have served on BPA strategic planning groups and initiatives.

Patrick O'Neill, M.A.- Co-Director Anthropology
I am interested in the position because
1.) I serve on the AIMS committee and AAC, and participation in budget and planning will allow me to bring budget-informed contributions to my other committee service.
2.) I want to learn about the budget and how it works to help inform my colleagues so they can initiate reform if appropriate.
3.) I would like to encourage and facilitate transparency and inter-committee collaborative discussions to enhance and to demonstrate shared governance with commitment to social justice and inclusivity.
4.) Faculty-built Curricula should be the basis of grant funding but should never be written specifically to accommodate grants that do not fund the faculty who participate in the implementation of curricular developments. Institutional, State, and Federal Funds should not be spent on superficial expenses just to ensure that the grants are not lost. Every expenditure should serve to pay faculty, to serve students and the community at large, and to accommodate programs, departments, and schools by increasing visibility, funding more faculty lines, funding institutional centers, and emphasizing education rather than profit. Nothing else makes sense.

UNIVERSITY POLICE ADVISORY COUNCIL
The intent of the University Police Advisory Council (UPAC) is to support the university police with recommendations and advice for planning regarding safety concerns and related police activity on the campus. The purpose of the UPAC is to create a “best in class” university police environment by assisting the university police by providing advice on utilizing community policing strategies on issues that impact the safety and quality of life of our diverse group of students, faculty, staff, and visitors. Part time and full-time faculty members are eligible and are selected by the AS Exec Committee to serve two-year staggered terms.
Michael Harville, Ph.D. - Counselor
I am interested in serving on the UPAC because I have experience working with our police department on a variety of public safety and mental health concerns. There have been systemwide discussions of having counselors respond to mental health crises on campus instead of the police. I would like to be part of the discussion on how we balance officer safety with public safety, especially for people of color.

Zachary Hays, Ph.D. – Assoc. Professor, Criminal Justice
I would be interested in serving on the University Police Advisory Council. I am an Associate Professor of Criminal Justice who specializes in policing and law enforcement with 10+ years of experience researching and teaching about the criminal justice system, and policing in particular. I have also worked on multiple funded research grants with the Bakersfield Police Department and am a member of the Bakersfield Safe Streets Partnership (police-community collaboration). I have also previously served in a similar function (faculty representative) for the Police Advisory Board at my previous institution (Washington State University).

Md Naser – Communications to serve a two-year term, September 2020 – September 2022.
Introducing Ally - an accessibility and usability service integrated in Canvas

Why?
All digital content provided to students needs to be accessible to students with sensory impairments. Further, the more content can be transformed from one medium to another, e.g. text to audio or audio to text, the more usable it is for students. By using Ally, we can increase the accessibility and usability of digital content.

What?
Ally is a software tool that integrates with Canvas to make digital content more accessible. It automatically checks course material against Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.1, it delivers guidance to instructors to improve accessibility of their course content, and it provides students with alternative formats such as audio, HTML, or electronic braille.

How does it impact me, a faculty member?
You can choose how Ally will impact your course content or choose to do nothing at all. Ally will automatically provide alternative formats of your course content. When you upload a text document or scanned document with sufficient clarity for the software to read, Ally will provide students with options to download that content as audio, Semantic HTML, OCR PDF, Electronic braille, and many more formats.

Improved Usability - Alternative formats benefit everyone.
Ally improves user experience for everyone, not only people with disabilities. For example, students can enjoy listening to written materials that have been converted to audio.

Instructors get help from Ally
Ally delivers guidance improving accessibility. Not only do instructors get feedback on content accessibility, but Ally provides it in step-by-step instructions.

Accessibility scores
Ally provides information about the accessibility of your existing course. Within 15-90 seconds, you get a score - both number and colored gauge – so you can make decisions about whether you want to increase the accessibility of your content.
Thursday September 3, 2020

Dear Dr. Hegde,

During its meeting on August 28, 2020, GECCo APPROVED the attached proposal to modify the Academic Planning Manual. We respectfully submit it for consideration by the CSUB Academic Senate.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Andreas Gebauer, Ph.D., Faculty Director
General Education Program
Appeal Process Revision

Appeals Process.

1. New General Education course approval requests are sent to the appropriate school curriculum committee for review first. With the approval of the school curriculum committee, the proposal is sent to the General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo) for approval to be included in the general education program.

2. The committee GECCo reviews the request using the guidelines and criteria on record. The committee GECCo provides a written justification of its findings. In case of rejection, (a) course revision(s) can be made based on the review and resubmitted to the committee GECCo.

3. Following an unsuccessful re-submission, a written appeal can be filed with CARS-the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) of the CSUB Academic Senate that outlines how the petitioner believes the committee GECCo misinterpreted or otherwise violated its guidelines and procedures on record.

4. CARS AAC will verify that all rules and procedures identified by the respective committee were followed in the course of the review. CARS AAC will, if necessary, conduct oral interviews and request further information from the committee.

5. If the CARS AAC review finds that the guidelines and procedures on record were applied correctly, the appeal is rejected.

6. If the CARS AAC review finds that the guidelines and procedures on record were applied inappropriately, the committee GECCo will be advised to reconsider. If the committee GECCo cannot resolve the issues raised by CARS AAC, then CARS AAC will make a final decision.

NOTE: CARS AAC only reviews whether procedures were followed. It does not review guidelines, criterion or courses.
Hi, Beth

Could you please place this new agenda item for next exec meeting under “GECCo Charge”? Please include Andreas’ email to provide context.

Thanks,
Aaron

------------------------------------------------

Dr. S. Aaron Hegde, Ph.D.
Chair, Academic Senate
Chair and Professor, Economics
Director, ERM Program
CSUB
9001 Stockdale Hwy
Bakersfield, CA 93311
shegde@csub.edu

From: Andreas Gebauer <agebauer@csub.edu>
Date: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 at 10:15 AM
To: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>
Subject: GECCo request to review charge

Hi Aaron,

I have been asked by GECCo to have the Academic Senate review a part of its charge that is described in the attached resolution, RES 1314049. The specific issue rests with point "11. Certification and decertification of courses and instructors." In this point, the issue is not the course certification/decertification, but the instructor certification/decertification. Since the GE program does not have its own faculty, the scheduling of courses is not done by the GE program but by the departments. The departments decide who to hire and then who to assign to which course. Thus, especially "decertification" is really not enforceable. This also raises issue with the CBA. So, we really do not know what to make out of this part of our charge and ask for clarification by the Academic Senate.

It will probably best to at the very least separate the two issues (Course certification and decertification and faculty certification/decertification), and then address how, if at all, GECCo and the GE Director should be involved in ensuring that faculty teaching GE courses are
meeting a common set of expectations. This was the original intent of point 11, to improve program integrity and cohesion.

As always, I am happy to meet with any committee that addresses this issue to further explain our concerns and provide feedback.

Thanks,

Andreas

Dr. Andreas Gebauer
Professor of Chemistry
General Education Faculty Director
California State University Bakersfield
RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate recommends approval of the “GEIC proposals entitled ‘Governance of the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield’ and ‘Transition Plan for the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield.’

Rationale: In March 2013 the Academic Senate approved a set of “Guiding Principles for General Education Reform at CSUB.” It also established a Task-Force to develop models for a General Education Program based on these principles with a report due back on University Day fall 2013. This report was made to the university community in fall 2013; a series of workshops and sessions were held on GE. The GE Task Force reported their recommendations to the Academic Senate. In November the Academic Senate approved the appointment of a General Education Implementation Committee with the following charge: “The General Education reform implementation committee shall develop Model 3, while paying careful attention to the most valuable features of Model 2, as reflected in the findings of the Task Force on General Education's report to the Academic Senate. In doing so, it may wish to consult with university constituencies, such as Student Affairs and others with expertise in advising, enrollment management, the first year experience, and instruction in basic skills.”

The GEIC met during the month of December, made a preliminary report to the university community on January 10 and to the DCLC on January 15th. This committee has now submitted its recommendations to the Academic Senate.

Approved by the Academic Senate on March 11, 2014
Sent to the President for approval on March 21, 2014
Approved by the President on April 3, 2014
Governance of the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield

The General Education program will be governed by a General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo), chaired by a Faculty Director. GECCo will have responsibility for administering the GE program and is seen as being inextricably connected to the Senate. The GE Faculty Director will provide monthly reports to the Academic Senate.

Responsibilities of the General Education Curriculum Committee

1. Work in coordination with the designated administrator
2. GE program review and GE program assessment
3. Training and Support of GE faculty
4. Faculty Interest Group (FIG) coordination
5. Skills Reinforcement Group (SRG) coordination
6. Review and revise program learning outcomes
7. Review and revise GE area, skill, theme and course requirement and student learning outcomes
8. Course appeal
9. General Education Modifications (substitutions and waivers)
10. Report to Academic Senate, including requests for any changes to GE structure
11. Certification and decertification of courses and instructors
12. Course review
13. Skill oversight
14. Theme oversight
15. Obtaining broad input from those involved in teaching in the GE Program and from the campus community.

Departments and school curriculum committees will initially approve course submissions. The General Education Curriculum Committee will have final course approval authority. Due to the volume of work relating to the GE program, we suggest that proper compensation be given to committee members.

Composition of the General Education Curriculum Committee

There shall be eight voting members of GECCo with staggered two-year terms: 2 elected representatives from each school (A&H, BPA, NSME, SS&E) and a non-voting GE Faculty Director. The committee will also include a non-voting representative of the office of Academic Programs and a non-voting student representative.

Selection of the GE Faculty Director

The GE Faculty Director will be a tenured faculty member appointed by the Provost in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee. The committee will put out a call to the campus faculty and will interview candidates prior to making a recommendation to the Provost.

Responsibilities of the GE Faculty Director (to be supported by the appropriate academic administrator)
1. Chair GECCo
2. Ensure that recommendations from GECCo regarding program funding and GE resource management are implemented
3. Support GE program review and GE program assessment
4. Coordinate training and support of GE faculty
5. Facilitate Faculty Interest Groups (FIGs)
6. Facilitate Skills Reinforcement Groups (SRGs)
7. Work collaboratively with department and program chairs and faculty to schedule GE courses to meet students’ needs.

Guidelines and Procedures for GE Certification of Courses

The following guidelines shall govern GE course submissions:

1. All course submissions must be approved by a department. If the course carries a school prefix, it must be approved by the corresponding school curriculum committee.

2. The information contained in proposals for GE certification must be applicable to all sections of the course, regardless of instructor. Departments and programs should carefully review all sections to ensure that they conform to the relevant Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Course Requirements.

3. Courses that are cross-listed as both graduate and undergraduate are not eligible for certification for general education.

4. If a course is included in a theme, or is required to reinforce a foundational skill, it must also be approved for that purpose.

Management of Themes

Normally there will be no more than 3 to 4 themes. Generation and approval of themes will follow a timeline established by GECCo. The thematic content of themes will be determined according to the following criteria: the need to meet student demand; the need to maintain coherence by limiting the total number of courses in GE; the quality of proposed themes; and their ability to support GE learning outcomes. Theme approval will be informed by comparisons among proposed themes and by balancing themes so they reflect the diverse disciplines of the campus.

Each theme will have a coordinator who will assure breadth and consistent thematic coherence. Theme coordinators should be compensated and will be elected by faculty members participating in the theme FIGs.

Because themes are interdisciplinary, they must demonstrate sufficient cross-disciplinary support for successful implementation. Once a theme has been established the proposal and/or elimination of individual courses within a theme must be advertised (e.g., through memos of intent) and approved by GECCo.

APPENDIX—Proposed Procedures
**Existing Curricular Policies**


School curriculum committee:
- A&H [http://www.csub.edu/ah/Curriculum_Committee/](http://www.csub.edu/ah/Curriculum_Committee/)
- NSM&E [http://www.csub.edu/nsme/curriculum.shtml](http://www.csub.edu/nsme/curriculum.shtml)

Approval of New Course: [http://www.csub.edu/undergradstudies/AcadSched/](http://www.csub.edu/undergradstudies/AcadSched/)

**GE Course Proposals**

Proposals for GE course certification will require a completed Course Certification Request Form. It is anticipated that the following information will be included:

1. the course title and number;
2. how often the department is willing to offer the course;
3. the number of units;
4. the PeopleSoft description of the course, including any prerequisites;
5. the established Course Requirements for GE Areas;
6. the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the GE Area, as well as any SLOs specific to the course;
7. the connection of all SLOs (GE area, and course-specific) to the activities and/or assignments students will complete to demonstrate they have met the SLOs;
8. a list of default texts and/or materials to be used in the course;
9. any additional course fees or costs;
10. a description of the grading policy;
11. a statement of the criteria used for evaluating students’ work; and
12. an outline of the topics to be covered.

**Process for Course Submission and Certification**

1. Course certification proposals will be submitted through the normal pre-established university procedures.
2. Faculty members will initiate the course certification process only after having received approval from the department faculty or other curriculum body with responsibility for curriculum development.
3. Course submissions shall contain the department chair’s signature for confirmation of departmental approval.
4. School Curriculum Committees should review courses and make recommendations to GECCo regarding the appropriateness of GE certification in a timely manner.
5. It is the responsibility of the Faculty Director to ensure that all course certification packets forwarded by the respective school Curriculum Committees are complete. A course shall be reviewed by GECCo within 30 business days.

GECCo may recommend any ONE of the following actions:

a. **Certified**: GECCo may certify the course. The Faculty Director will forward certified course packets to the office of the Associate Vice-President of Academic Programs, the school curriculum committee chair, Dean, relevant faculty and department chair.

b. **Revise and Re-Submit**: GECCo may return the certification packet to the submitting faculty member for revision. In this case, a letter of explanation will be provided to the school curriculum committee chair, Dean, relevant faculty and department chair. The submitting faculty member may revise and resubmit the proposal to GECCo indicating that it is a resubmission. Upon review by the Faculty Director, the proposal will be returned to the subcommittee for approval.

c. **Denied Certification**: Courses that have been denied certification will be returned to the respective school curriculum committee chair, Dean, relevant faculty and department chair with an explanation of the reasons they were deemed to be inadequate.

6. The period for certification will be three years. The course may be recertified based upon a review of the course.

**Participation Requirements for GE Faculty: FIGs and SRGs**

A number of faculty groups will be established to focus on themes (FIGs), the reinforcement of skills (SRGs), and other GE matters. These groups are not expected to be decision-making bodies but serve to facilitate broad consultation, to give guidance to FIG/SRG leaders, to nurture interdisciplinary understanding, and to provide faculty development opportunities. Our long-term goal is to maintain a vital program through ongoing faculty participation. Toward that end, we expect faculty to participate in a minimum of one group each semester they teach within the GE Program and to rotate between groups each semester.
APPENDIX—Philosophy for Designing and Submitting a GE Course

The General Education program at California State University, Bakersfield is designed to enhance the success of students, both at the university and in their life beyond, and to share with students the core values of our university. As such, GE courses are expected to align with the senate-endorsed University Learning Outcomes (ULOs) (Approved by the Academic Senate on March 11, 2010).

The General Education program at CSUB delivers on our promise to student success and our ULOs. Therefore, the GE program at CSUB is not merely a collection of courses representing our rich and diverse academic disciplines, but rather it is an intentional program of study that reflects the central role of the Liberal Arts as defined by the Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) vision. This program of study emphasizes a commitment to preparing students with discipline specific knowledge including foundational skills; knowledge integration, reflection, and application; and life-long learning skills.

As a coherent program of study, like major and minor programs, the General Education program requires assessment, oversight, and evaluation. These processes, as carried out by the General Education Curriculum Committee and its various subcommittees, exemplify the tenets of faculty governance. The members of the GEIC share these philosophical statements in the hope that they will help to guide the process by which the GE curriculum and its courses are constructed. In particular, we urge faculty to recognize the following:

- Student success is hindered by the lack of availability of GE courses, especially when students come to expect that particular courses will be offered. Thus faculty are expected to carefully plan their GE contributions and to only offer courses for certification that they can staff and offer on a regular basis.
- Research indicates that a well-integrated and cohesive GE program improves students’ ability to learn and succeed during their college experience and after graduation. Thus faculty members are encouraged to think of the place of their courses in the wider context of the overall GE program.
- The audience for a GE course is potentially very different from that of a course designed for majors. Thus it is appropriate for the disciplines to determine the knowledge and skills that they feel are relevant and important for the general student body to have and to deliver these as GE courses with broad appeal.

Course Evaluation Criteria:

The General Education Curriculum Committee and subcommittees are responsible for certifying courses for inclusion in the General Education curriculum based on the following criteria:

1) Student Learning Outcomes: Faculty submitting courses for certification must demonstrate how students will acquire the information and develop the necessary skills to meet the SLOs for the relevant area(s) through an assessment plan.
2) Course Requirements: Each area of the GE program will have multiple course expectations. Course requirements address logistical issues and course content. Faculty submitting courses for certification must be able to demonstrate how their courses meet these expectations.
Transition Plan for the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield

Transition from GE Implementation Committee to GECCo Governance

GECCo shall be constituted as soon as possible. Nominations and elections for GECCo membership shall occur without delay. In the meantime, GEIC is charged with seeking consultation with current and potential GE faculty and continuing to make preparations for implementation of the new GE requirements. Any proposals would come before GECCo for further refinement and ratification before taking effect.

Staggering of Terms in GECCo

Half of the initial terms of GECCo members should be three years in length to ensure continuity. The terms of the other members of the committee, and all subsequent terms of service, shall be two years.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 14, 2020

TO: Dr. Aaron Hegde / Chair, Academic Senate
     Dr. Jinping Sun / University Program Review Committee
     Dr. Debra Jackson / Dean, Academic Programs
     Dr. Vernon Harper / Provost & Vice President, Academic Affairs

CC: Dr. Jinping Sun / University Program Review Committee
    Dr. Debra Jackson / Dean, Academic Programs
    Dr. Vernon Harper / Provost & Vice President, Academic Affairs

FROM: Dr. Danielle Solano / Chair, University Program Review Committee

RE: Recommendations from the UPRC for Changes to the Program Review Policy and Procedures

During Summer 2020, Dr. Jinping Sun conducted an extensive study of Academic Program Review at CSUB. In Dr. Sun’s work, she reviewed the current WSCUC guidelines and collected data on the program review process at other CSUs. Dr. Sun then used this information to recommend changes to CSUB program review documents, identify issues of concern in academic program review at CSUB, and propose recommendations for improving academic program review at CSUB.

Informed by Dr. Sun’s work, the UPRC reviewed and made recommendations for changes to the current “Program Review Policy and Procedures” document. While we have attached a version with track changes, our changes were so extensive that we are highlighting them here.

Specifically, the UPRC:
1. Edited the document for clarification and removal of repetitive text.
2. Updated it to reflect current procedures.
3. In the “Program Self-Study Committee” section, clarified the role of students and/or staff in program review.
4. In the “External Review” section, clarified and updated the process for selection of external reviewers, and added a deadline for the external reviewer to submit the draft report, and a timeframe for the program to correct any factual errors to the external reviewer's report.
5. In the “School Dean Review” section, changed the Dean's Review to a requirement (as opposed to an option).
6. In the “Provost Review” section, added a deadline for completion of the MOUAP and clarified that the MOUAP should be initiated by the Office of the Provost (rather than the Dean and/or department).
7. Moved the section on Annual Reports to the end of the "Organization Structure for the Review Process" section and added additional information regarding annual reports (including a requirement that annual reports must be submitted to the UPRC).
8. Added a section on Repository and Reporting.
9. In the “Procedures for Programs with External Accreditation” section, clarified procedures for program review of accredited programs.
10. Added a section on mid-cycle reports.
11. Added a section on extensions and late program reviews.

Currently, the UPRC is working to review the program review template based on the recommendations from Dr. Sun’s report. (As this does not require Senate approval, we opted to prioritize those changes that must go through the Senate.) We also intend to create an external reviewer evaluation template. Also, we would like to note that recommendations above include more active involvement of the UPRC in the annual report process. If the Senate supports this, the UPRC would also be willing to develop a template for use in annual reports.

Attachments to this document include:
2. Revised version of the CSUB Program Review Policy and Procedures document (with track changes)
3. Revised version of the CSUB Program Review Policy and Procedures document (clean)
4. Dr. Jinping Sun’s full report “Academic Program Review at CSUB: A Continuous Improvement Process” with all nine appendices
5. WASC Program Review rubric

Please use the above documents to inform your decisions and recommendations. Do not hesitate to contact us if you require any further information.
As a university dedicated to meeting the needs of its region and to providing leadership and expertise for students and the community, CSUB must actively plan for the future. An evidence-based program review is an essential component of the active planning process. The required elements of a program review are: evidence-based self-examination, assessment of student learning outcomes, evaluation of resources necessary to ensure quality, and the harmony of the program visions and plans with those of the university. Program review provides a critical reflection of who we are, where we are going, where we should be going, and how we should get there. It involves a program’s commitment and willingness to candidly evaluate goals, objectives, and activities, through outcomes-based assessment of student learning. Consequently, ever improving decisions on curriculum and budgeting of scarce resources are made when faculty use program review data to inform the decision making process.

The program review process strives to inform program decisions based upon evidence-based assessment and assessment results in turn lead to a foundation for informed budget and curricular decisions. This dynamic interplay, which is the heart of the program review, is primarily a faculty-driven process. This faculty endeavor utilizes accreditation reports (when available) and annual reports to reduce redundant reporting and to facilitate comparisons across departments, schools, and universities. 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). Consequently, program review establishes a faculty reviewed process by which evidence-based claims 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 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. Successful program review is dependent upon faculty willingness to engage in an intensive and comprehensive self-study process that uses data and honest professional discourse about the
evaluation criteria to be applied, changes in knowledge, the relationship of programs to one another, and the educational needs of students and society at large. To achieve these purposes, faculty are required to evaluate the program’s student learning outcomes, annual assessment findings, benchmarking results, subsequent changes, and evidence concerning the impact of these changes. Such assessment demands that well-qualified internal and external reviewers evaluate the program’s learning outcomes, assessment plan, evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact. Such reviewers provide evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. It is expected that the program faculty use this feedback to improve student learning. Program faculty are to prepare a retrospective Self-Study and a forward looking Program Plan in advance of the next cycle of review. It is expected that the campus will systematically integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, through negotiation of formal action plans with mutually agreed-upon commitments.

ANNUAL REPORTS

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 is asked to 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. A narrative, not expected to exceed two pages, focuses on clarifying and explaining the data and discussing any emerging trends. If the program has a MOUAP, it is required to evaluate the extent to which it has met any program goals or benchmarks and may also report the status of agreed upon resource allocations. The cumulative data and narratives will form the foundation for the next program review.

ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE FOR THE REVIEW PROCESS

PROGRAM SELF-STUDY COMMITTEE:

Each program conducting a review shall select a Self-Study Committee of at least three members. In consultation with program faculty and representative students, the committee is responsible for the preparation of a Self-Study and a Program Plan (Planning) document. The committee receives a packet containing the review guidelines and deadlines, model program reviews, and other material. The chair of the department or interdisciplinary program is responsible for ensuring the 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 the date on which approval was voted.

EXTERNAL REVIEW OR PROGRAM ACCREDITATION:

The AVPAP, in consultation with the school dean, may provide a list of available reviewers from which a program may select. When a list is not available, the program proposes an external reviewer in consultation with the AVPAP and is asked to assure the program review committee that the individual is capable of carrying out a neutral review. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs maintains a fund to pay for the external reviewer.

An external reviewer will evaluate each program as part of the program review or accreditation process. The purpose for the external reviewer is to assist the faculty to improve the quality of
their program by providing a new, comparative, and broader perspective on the program, its last seven years of operation, and its plans for the next seven years. The external reviewer will conduct an exit interview with the program faculty, the chair of the University Program Review Committee (UPRC), the appropriate school dean, and the Associate Vice President for Academic Programs and Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies (AVPAP), and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The external reviewer will provide the Office of Academic Programs with a report that provides comments and recommendations regarding the program. The program faculty has the opportunity to review the report (within a reasonable time period) for factual inaccuracies and misperceptions and submit a written response. The program faculty’s written response to the External Reviewer’s report becomes part of the package of documents subsequently reviewed by the UPRC, the appropriate school dean, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

SCHOOL DEAN REVIEW:

School deans are also responsible for assessment processes, the management of resources and strategic planning activities. The school dean, after reading the program self-study and program plan, and external reviewer's report or accreditation report, may add another review with comments and recommendations. In the case of interschool programs, all relevant deans have an opportunity to add their comments and recommendations.

UNIVERSITY REVIEW:

Upon receiving the documents written by the school dean, the Program Self-Study Committee, and the external reviewer(s), the University Program Review Committee engages in a review of the program. 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 five WTUs of assigned time for his/her two year service.

The UPRC will examine all documents developed during the review. On the basis of its examination the committee shall 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 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.

PROVOST REVIEW

After examining the program review documents, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall meet with the program coordinator, the chair of the UPRC and other individuals who have roles in the resource allocation and planning process (e.g., the department and school dean) to discuss the program review and recommendations. At the close of the meeting the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, through active negotiation with the program faculty and
appropriate school dean, shall prepare a Memorandum of Understanding and Action Plan (MOUAP) for allocation of academic affairs resources to academic programs 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 program faculty and the school dean shall be responsible for implementing the recommendations.

Copies of the documents from each program review shall be maintained in the office of Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate office. Copies of the concluding Memorandum of Understanding Action Plan (MOUAP) for allocation of academic affairs resources to academic programs negotiated between the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the program faculty and the appropriate school dean will be sent to the Academic Senate, the appropriate school dean, the chair of the UPRC, and the chair of the Program Self-Study Committee. Finally, at the end of the academic year the AVPAP shall circulate a summary of the major findings, recommendations and budgetary allotments for all programs reviewed.

PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAMS WITH EXTERNAL REVIEW FOR ACCREDITATION

Those programs that have external accreditation procedures are excused from duplicating information necessary for that external accreditation procedure in their program review process. Given that each accreditation procedure is unique, on a case-by-case basis certain of the elements identified in the Guidelines for Documents Prepared during the Program Review Process may simply be included as part of the accreditation documents submitted with their program review materials. This often includes such information on students, faculty, resources and enrollments compiled by the office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment (IRPA) and that forms the basis of the annual academic scans, reflection on program assessment of student learning outcomes, and strategic planning for the future. Consequently, program faculty of such externally accredited programs should include their accreditation documents and only those elements NOT encompassed by those accreditation documents as their program review documents.

APPROVED BY ACADEMIC SENATE June 21, 2010
APPROVED BY PRESIDENT July 28, 2010
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 required elements of a program review are 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 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 process.

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 claims 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.

scare resources and to plan for change. Successful program review is dependent upon faculty willingness to engage in an intensive and comprehensive self-study process that uses data and honest professional discourse about the evaluation criteria to be applied, changes in knowledge, the relationship of programs to one another, and the educational needs of students and society at large.
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, and 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

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 data collection, development of figures, etc. 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 for Academic Affairs (Provost) 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 new and 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. 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 (within a reasonable time period) for factual inaccuracies and evidence concerning the impact of these changes.
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Office of Academic Programs to become part of the package of documents subsequently reviewed by the appropriate school dean, the UPRC, and the Provost.

**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 two weeks 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 for his/her 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 a month after examining 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, 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, 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**
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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 and the UPRC 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 annual report and program review documents shall be maintained in the office of Academic Affairs. At the end of the academic year, the AVPAA shall prepare a summary of the major findings, recommendations and budgetary allotments for all programs reviewed that year.

**PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAMS WITH EXTERNAL ACCREDITATION**

All degree-granting 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 review that culminates in a MOUAP.

**MID-CYCLE REPORTS**

---
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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 a one-semester extension 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, 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 may elect to proceed with the program review without a self-study prepared by the program.
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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 required elements of a program review are 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 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 process.

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 claims 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, and 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

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 data collection, development of figures, etc. 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 for Academic Affairs (Provost) 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 new and 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. 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.

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 two weeks 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 for his/her 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 a month after examining 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, 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, 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 and the UPRC 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 annual report and program review documents shall be maintained in the office of Academic Affairs. At the end of the academic year, the AVPAA shall prepare a summary of the major findings, recommendations and budgetary allotments for all programs reviewed that year.

PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAMS WITH EXTERNAL ACCREDITATION

All degree-granting 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 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 a one-semester extension 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, 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 may elect to proceed with the program review without a self-study prepared by the program.
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On February 26, 2020, California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) received reaffirmation of accreditation for a period of eight years by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). One of the recommendations made by the Commission is to “foster a culture of continuous improvement, re-establish a system for completing rigorous and consistent program reviews.” To address academic program review, CSUB will be asked, during a Special Visit by the Commission in spring 2023, to “provide:

i. Description of revised program review process and realistic program review schedule
ii. List of scheduled, performed, and completed program reviews
iii. Two examples of using program review results for continuous improvement.”

To assist with the University’s efforts to improve its academic program review process, I was appointed as a Faculty Leadership Fellow at the end of May 2020. Beginning June 1, 2020 and throughout summer 2020, I looked into academic program review at CSUB and other CSUs, interviewed program review officers from seven CSUs and based on the research, proposed some recommendations for improving academic program review at CSUB. In addition, Dr. Jackson and I held weekly Zoom meetings to discuss the work I completed and to plan for next steps. The following sections summarize the tasks we accomplished at the end of summer 2020.

WSCUC Guidelines and Academic Program Review at CSUB

I started with a review of WSCUC Program Review Resource Guide (updated October 2015) that intends to “assist colleges and universities with meeting program review expectations within the WSCUC 2013 Handbook of Accreditation” (p.4). Designed as a “good practice” guide, it provides an overview of WSCUC standards for program review, definition and purpose of a program review, general principles, steps and responsibilities, key components of a program review process, and how to use program review results in planning and budgeting. Highlighted throughout the guide are three features of the program review process under the WSCUC standards: “outcomes-based assessment of student learning and development,” “evidence-based claims and decision-making,” and “use of program review results to inform planning and budgeting” (p.4).

Then I reviewed program review documents at CSUB, beginning with the website of Academic Programs where relevant academic program review information is made available to the public. Information posted on the website includes academic program review policy, procedures, and templates, instructions for annual program reports, University Program Review Committee (UPRC) Workshop in Fall 2019, Program Review Progress Report form, program review schedule, and UPRC membership for AY 2019-2020. A review of these documents shows some discrepancies in the program review policy and procedures, which are summarized in Appendix 1. I also looked into the UPRC Folder in BOX that the Office of Academic Programs maintains and the UPRC Folder in SharePoint that UPRC members share. Included in both folders are academic program review policies, procedures, and processes, UPRC Annual Reports to the Senate, program review schedule, reviews by program, MOUs, and other relevant information. Box contains additional program review information. For example, Box archives UPRC meeting agendas and minutes since AY 2010-2011 while SharePoint covers UPRC meeting agendas and minutes since AY 2015-2016. Appendix 2 compares program review documents in the UPRC folders in BOX and SharePoint.

The review of CSUB academic program review documents from these three sources (Academic Programs website, BOX, and SharePoint), in light of WSCUC standards, provides ample evidence to support the WSCUC recommendations mentioned at the beginning of this report. Specific issues of concern in academic program review at CSUB, as identified by the UPRC over the years, are listed in Appendix 3. In addition, a question came up during the first stage of the research: what information should be made publicly available on the CSUB program review website? Given the three different sources of
information that is accessible to different audiences, it might be worthwhile to discuss if additional program review information should be posted on the CSUB website.

**Academic Program Review at the Other 22 CSUs**

The second stage of the research focused on academic program review at the other 22 CSUs. I searched their websites, went through their program review documents that were available online, and identified their best practices that we might be able to emulate here at CSUB. Appendix 4 outlines what was available on each CSU’s program review website at the time of the Internet search. Note that a caveat to what is included in Appendix 4 is that not all program review information is posted on their websites – just like CSUB – and what is available online is updated on a regular basis.

The survey of other CSUs’ program review websites provides a wealth of information and good practices that may be adapted to CSUB. Based on this research, Dr. Jackson and I interviewed, via Zoom, academic program review officers from seven CSUs (including East Bay, Fresno, Long Beach, Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Jose, and Stanislaus). The seven campuses were selected based on the program review information posted on their websites at the time of this research. The interviews focused on each campus’ unique program review practices as well as general contexts and procedures that may provide helpful information for improving the program review process at CSUB. Appendix 5 shows a list of people we interviewed and questions that guided our conversations.

Two themes (or principles) of academic program review that all seven CSUs emphasized during the Zoom meetings are accountability and efficiency. To the seven CSUs, academic program review is one way to hold them accountable to students, CSU Board of Trustees, WSCUC, and the public that they are providing quality educational programs. Academic program review also serves as a vehicle to promote a culture of systematic and continuous reflection and assessment for programmatic improvements on each campus, and to align with and support the mission of the department, college/school, and university. Another aspect of accountability in academic program review is to provide transparency into the assessment of student learning, as well as into institutional planning and resource allocation. To achieve the goal of accountability, all seven CSUs provide clear program review policies, procedures, and timelines, actively engage faculty, deans, staff, and other stakeholders, and post essential program review information on their websites. Secondly, academic program review takes tremendous amount of time and effort, and the seven CSUs always look for efficiency in the process. They hold regular orientations and workshops on program review, make assessment information readily available, provide templates for self-study reports, design separate guidelines for externally accredited programs to streamline their program review process, and have an effective tracking system to ensure proper and timely flow of program review documents throughout the process.

In the context of accountability and efficiency, the seven CSUs we interviewed identified the following best practices in their program review process:

- Create a culture of assessment and continuous improvement;
- Have clear program review guidelines;
- Establish clear timelines and send out reminders;
- Develop a program review data dashboard;
- Hold orientations and workshops where faculty can work on their program reviews;
- Prepare templates for self-studies, program plans, external review reports, MOUs (or action plans), and annual reports, which focus on essential reporting requirements;

---

1 We are indebted to the program review officers at the seven CSUs who took the time to share with us their experiences so we can benefit from the lessons they have learned.
• Assign a Program Review Committee liaison who works with a program under review and shepherds its program review process from the beginning;
• Include a faculty signature page in the self-study report to ensure all program faculty are involved in the program review;
• Have the deans’ support (such as requiring deans to reflect and comment on self-studies, program plans, external review reports, and recommendations from the Program Review Committee);
• Implement a modified program review process for externally accredited programs (such as providing a template or checklist for accredited programs, according to which they just need to address sections of program reviews that are not discussed in the accreditation reports);
• Ask programs to submit a list of potential external reviewers when they submit their self-studies and program plans, so the external reviewer visits can be coordinated and scheduled in advance;
• Involve program faculty, deans, administration, and other constituencies in the MOU meetings to discuss action plans and bring a closure to the program review process;
• Integrate annual reports into academic program review in a way that annual reports feed into periodic program reviews and there are regular follow-up activities for closing the loop; and
• Maintain staff and leadership stability in academic program review.

Proposed Recommendations for Improving Academic Program Review at CSUB
Following WSCUC’s guiding principles governing the program review process and drawing from the good practices of other CSUs, we recommend the following for improving academic program review at CSUB:

1. Promote a culture of student learning assessment and continuous improvement;
2. Engage faculty, Academic Senate, deans, administration, and other constituencies; and
3. Create a transparent system of accountability.

Proposed changes to address specific issues of concern in academic program review are presented in Appendix 6. Appendix 6 starts with an overview of the steps in the program review process and then addresses key components of academic program review at CSUB in the sequence in which they occur: the self-study and program plan, followed by the external review, and culminating with the MOUAPs. The documentation and reporting of program reviews is included as well to complete the program review process at CSUB (see Appendix 7 for recommendations on how to organize program review documents). Along with identified issues of concern in academic program review and proposed strategies to address them, Appendix 6 also indicates who will be responsible to implement each suggested change.

Note that:
• Some recommendations are not new. For example, reaffirming the self-study and MOUAP templates has been proposed by the UPRC multiple times over the years.
• Some recommendations have already been implemented (such as holding workshops on academic program review and submitting a Program Review Progress Report), and we need to continue and refine these practices.
• For other recommendations, there are general guidelines in place at CSUB (such as program reviews for externally accredited programs). As evidenced in other CSUs, developing a modified program review process, particularly a template or checklist, for these programs will improve the efficiency of program review process.
• Some recommendations, such as requesting a program review extension, the role of deans, and using MOUAPs as the basis for institutional planning and budgeting, need to be reinforced to ensure the consistency and rigor of academic program review at CSUB.
• New recommendations include developing a program review dashboard, integrating annual reports into academic program review process, and posting additional program review documents online. Considered as best practices by other CSUs, they underscore the accountability and efficiency of their program review process.
Meeting with the Provost and Chair of Academic Senate
To discuss the next steps, Dr. Jackson and I had a Zoom meeting with Dr. Harper and Dr. Hegde. Both Dr. Harper and Dr. Hegde expressed their support for improving academic program review at CSUB. Dr. Hegde will refer the UPRC items to the Senate Academic Affairs Committee in fall 2020.

Summary
The academic program review process at CSUB is an important way to evaluate the effectiveness of its academic programs in achieving excellence of student learning and to improve the quality of education on a continuing basis. As we reflect on the commendations and recommendations by WSCUC and move on to the next cycle, an examination of our current program review process as well as those of other CSUs represents the first step in our commitment to high quality academic programs.

The proposed recommendations for improving academic program review at CSUB, based on a review of all 23 CSUs, will be circulated and discussed among faculty, deans, Academic Senate, administration, and other constituencies in Fall 2020. A special focus will be on program directors/department chairs who are frontline leaders of program review and deans/associate deans who play an important role in linking academic program review to institutional planning and budgeting. To get their perspectives of the program review process, a survey of program directors/department chairs and deans/associate deans is recommended – see Appendices 8 and 9, respectively, for a list of proposed questions.

Academic program review is a faculty-driven, outcomes-based, collaborative, integrated, and continuous process, and improving program review requires a concerted effort and commitment of the entire campus community. With conversations and consultations across the campus in the upcoming years, we hope to incorporate the feedback from various groups, finalize and approve the proposed recommendations and by spring 2021, establish a timeline for when these tasks should be accomplished. Hopefully we will begin implementing the recommended changes in AY 2021-2022, and collect artifacts and make necessary revisions as we work through the process.
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## PROGRAM REVIEW RUBRIC

**Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required Elements of the Self-Study</td>
<td>Program faculty may be required to provide a list of program-level student learning outcomes.</td>
<td>Faculty are required to provide the program’s student learning outcomes and summarize annual assessment findings.</td>
<td>Faculty are required to provide the program’s student learning outcomes, annual assessment studies, findings, and resulting changes. They may be required to submit a plan for the next cycle of assessment studies.</td>
<td>Faculty are required to evaluate the program’s student learning outcomes, annual assessment findings, benchmarking results, subsequent changes, and evidence concerning the impact of these changes. They present a plan for the next cycle of assessment studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of Review</td>
<td>Internal and external reviewers do not address evidence concerning the quality of student learning in the program other than grades.</td>
<td>Internal and external reviewers address indirect and possibly direct evidence of student learning in the program; they do so at the descriptive level, rather than providing an evaluation.</td>
<td>Internal and external reviewers analyze direct and indirect evidence of student learning in the program and offer evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. They have sufficient expertise to evaluate program efforts. Departments use the feedback to improve their work.</td>
<td>Well-qualified internal and external reviewers evaluate the program’s learning outcomes, assessment plan, evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact. They give evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. The department uses the feedback to improve student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Budgeting</td>
<td>The campus has not integrated program reviews into planning and budgeting processes.</td>
<td>The campus has attempted to integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, but with limited success.</td>
<td>The campus generally integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, but not through a formal process.</td>
<td>The campus systematically integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, e.g., through negotiating formal action plans with mutually agreed-upon commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts</td>
<td>No individual or committee on campus provides feedback to departments on the quality of their outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, etc.</td>
<td>An individual or committee occasionally provides feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, etc.</td>
<td>A well-qualified individual or committee provides annual feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, etc. Departments use the feedback to improve their work.</td>
<td>A well-qualified individual or committee provides annual feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, benchmarking results, and assessment impact. Departments effectively use the feedback to improve student learning. Follow-up activities enjoy institutional support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Student Experience</td>
<td>Students are unaware of and uninvolved in program review.</td>
<td>Program review may include focus groups or conversations with students to follow up on results of surveys</td>
<td>The internal and external reviewers examine samples of student work, e.g., sample papers, portfolios, and capstone projects. Students may be invited to discuss what they learned and how they learned it.</td>
<td>Students are respected partners in the program review process. They may offer poster sessions on their work, demonstrate how they apply rubrics to self-assess, and/or provide their own evaluative feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guidelines for Using the Program Review Rubric

For the fullest picture of an institution’s accomplishments, reviews of written materials should be augmented with interviews at the time of the visit.

Dimensions of the Rubric:
1. Self-Study Requirements. The campus should have explicit requirements for the program’s self-study, including an analysis of the program’s learning outcomes and a review of the annual assessment studies conducted since the last program review. Faculty preparing the self-study can reflect on the accumulating results and their impact, and plan for the next cycle of assessment studies. As much as possible, programs can benchmark findings against similar programs on other campuses.

   Questions: Does the campus require self-studies that include an analysis of the program’s learning outcomes, assessment studies, assessment results, benchmarking results, and assessment impact, including the impact of changes made in response to earlier studies? Does the campus require an updated assessment plan for the subsequent years before the next program review?

2. Self-Study Review. Internal reviewers (on-campus individuals) and external reviewers (off-campus individuals, usually disciplinary experts) evaluate the program’s learning outcomes, assessment plan, assessment evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact; and they provide evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement.

   Questions: Who reviews the self-studies? Do they have the training or expertise to provide effective feedback? Do they routinely evaluate the program’s learning outcomes, assessment plan, assessment evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact? Do they provide suggestions for improvement? Do departments effectively use this feedback to improve student learning?

3. Planning and Budgeting. Program reviews are not be pro forma exercises; they should be tied to planning and budgeting processes, with expectations that increased support will lead to increased effectiveness, such as improving student learning and retention rates.

   Questions: Does the campus systematically integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes? Are expectations established for the impact of planned changes?

4. Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts. Institutions often find considerable variation in the quality of assessment efforts across programs. While program reviews encourage departments to reflect on multi-year assessment results, some programs are likely to require more immediate feedback, usually based on a required annual assessment report. This feedback might be provided by an assessment director or committee, relevant dean or others; and whoever has this responsibility should have the expertise to provide quality feedback.

   Questions: Does someone or a committee have the responsibility for providing annual feedback on the assessment process? Does this person or team have the expertise to provide effective feedback? Does this person or team routinely provide feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, benchmarking results, and assessment impact? Do departments effectively use this feedback to improve student learning?

5. The Student Experience. Students have a unique perspective on a given program of study; they know better than anyone what it means to go through it as a student. Program review can take advantage of that perspective and build it into the review.

   Questions: Are students aware of the purpose and value of program review? Are they involved in preparations and the self-study? Do they have an opportunity to interact with internal or external reviewers, demonstrate and interpret their learning, and provide evaluative feedback?
Appendix 1: Suggested Changes to CSUB Program Review Documents

1. “Program Review Policy & Procedures (Spring 2010):”
   - Annual Report: Is it current?
     - Narrative not exceeding 2 pages
   - External Review:
     - Who attends the external reviewer exit meeting?
   - Role of deans: “may add another review”
   - UPRC
     - UPRC member reassigned time: 5 WTUs
     - Include UPRC Charge?
   - Provost: Who prepares MOUAP?
   - Repository of program review documents: both Academic Programs and Senate?

2. “Program Review Template (updated 5/22/2019)”
   - Number of copies submitted: electronic + 3 + 10 (p.1 and p.2)
   - Dean: “has option” to provide comments (p.1)
   - Dean and faculty develop a draft MOUAP.

3. “Academic Program Annual Reports”
   - Is this the current version?
   - The new narrative not exceeding 2 pages
   - Template for annual report to be updated?
   - Appendix IV (p.11): for program assessment, still use Quarter

4. “Preparing a Winning Self-Study” (UPRC Workshop in Fall 2019)
   - Number of copies submitted: electronic + 7 complete hard copies (p.6)
## Appendix 2: UPRC Folders in Box and SharePoint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Folder</th>
<th>Box</th>
<th>SharePoint in OneDrive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No 2013-2014</td>
<td>- No 2013-2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No 2015-2016</td>
<td>- No 2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>2010-2011 to 2018-2019</td>
<td>Archives (No folder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Additional documents-2016-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• UPRC Charge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• UPRC concerns: see Draft 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Agenda-Minutes 2010-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agendas:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agendas for 2012-13: in the folders of 2011-12 and 2013-14 agenda folders; also available in UPRC → Archives → Program Reviews → 2012 13 Program Reviews → 2012 13 Agenda’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2015-16 Agendas: incomplete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No separate folder for 2016-2017 agendas: 2016-2017 agendas are in the folder of “Minutes 2016-2017”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No separate folder for 2018-19 agendas; 2018-19 agendas are in the folder of “Minutes 2018-2019”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2018-19 agendas for Spring 2019 semester are in “UPRC Meeting Agenda-Minutes 2019-2020 folder”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minutes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incomplete minutes: 2011-2012, 2015-2016,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No minutes for 2012-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2018-19 minutes for Spring 2019 semester are in “UPRC Meeting Agenda-Minutes 2019-2020 folder”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Completed reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Arts 2010-2011 Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Computer Science Review 2010-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PEAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PPA 2010-2011 Review</td>
<td>Information in this folder is duplicate, which is available in UPRC → Reviews by Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Correspondence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. External reviewer information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. General UPRC letterhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Memo’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. MOUAP Archives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• MOUAP template</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Signed MOUAPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Program Review Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Program Review Templates 2016-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Program Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Program Reviews by year (2009-10 – 2017-18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Duplicate; files are also available in UPRC ➔ Reviews by Program
- 2014-15 Program Reviews folder – MSA Administration (online): includes two different files from those in Reviews by Program - _Administration 2015-16 [suggestion: Include two files in the Reviews by Program folder]
- 2016-17 Program Reviews folder – MA Educational Administration: suggestion: include a folder on MAEA in Reviews by Program folder under “Education MA”
- 2016-17 Program Reviews folder:
  - also includes 2016-17 meeting agendas and minutes (9/28/2016 – 5/8/2017)
  - also includes UPRC Workshop 2-10-17 (including agenda, PPT, eval forms)
- 2017-18 Program Reviews folder:
  - Also includes 2017-18 Meetings
    (Agendas: 10/2/2017 – 5/7/2018;

m. Program scans
n. Thank you letters
o. Trend analysis
p. UPRC Committee
q. UPRC Grid
r. UPRC letterhead Contains same information as in General UPRC Letterhead folder (see f)
s. UPRC Previous committee members
   • contains same but less information as in UPRC Committee (see p)
t. WASC
u. Welcome letters
v. Welcome letters(1)
   • contains same but less information as in Welcome Letters.

| Mid-Cycle Report | Folder called “Mid-Cycle Report 8-21-19”  
2 files, same document, one in Word, one in PDF | 1 file in PDF |

| MOUAP Template | Yes  
1 file in Word | No folder |

| MOUAP | No separate folder  
Signed MOUAPs are in UPRC ➔ Archives ➔ MOUAP Archives | 18 files; signed MOUAPs |

| Program Review Procedures and Templates | - Program Review Progress Report: 2 files, same, one in Word, one in PDF  
- The rest are same. | - No Program Review Progress Report  
- The rest are same. |

| Program Review Progress Report | 1 file in PDF | No folder |

| Program Review Taskforce | No Folder | 1 file: Program_Review_Taskforce_Notes_04_18_2017 |

<p>| Program Review | 2 files, same, one in Word, one in PDF | No folder |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Template with Timeline</th>
<th>Reviews by Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Templates</td>
<td>No Folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 files: MOUAP Template (2011-12 to 2016-17) + Program_Review_Template 2 (1/17/2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews by Program</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 folders + 1 File</td>
<td>No Folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual program review listed separately in its own folder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration: Mixed up</td>
<td>No Folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12 Folder: This is for MS HCA. 2015-16 Folder: This is for online MSA. There is a separate folder for MS-HCA – see below. Include two files in this folder from UPRC → Archives → Program Reviews → 2014 15 Program Reviews → MSA Administration (online)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Studies</td>
<td>Applied Studies (No Folder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same PDF files + 1 PDF “BS in Applied Studies RES031”</td>
<td>In Completed Reviews folder. No “BS in Applied Studies RES031”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA and MA Spanish</td>
<td>BA and MA Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same PDF files + 1 more Word File – “Notification”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Art</td>
<td>BA Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same PDF files + 33 more Word/Excel Files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA CAFS</td>
<td>BA CAFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same PDF files + more Word/Excel files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Communications</td>
<td>BA Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more documents</td>
<td>Archives/Supporting Documents Folders are empty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Human Biological Sciences</td>
<td>BA Human Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same PDF files + more Word files</td>
<td>In Completed Reviews folder, there is another folder called Human Biological Sciences. Files are included in BA Human Biological Sciences folder in BOX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Liberal Studies</td>
<td>BA Liberal Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Music</td>
<td>BA Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Political Science</td>
<td>BA Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same PDF files + more Word files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Psychology</td>
<td>BA Psychology (NO Folder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Completed Reviews folder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Religious Studies</td>
<td>BA Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More files</td>
<td>Supporting Documents Folder is empty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Sociology</td>
<td>BA Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Theatre</td>
<td>BA Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same PDF files + 1 more Word and 1 more Excel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>Supporting Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-BS-MS Geology</td>
<td>same PDF files + few more Word/Excel files;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Supporting Documents folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-MA Anthropology</td>
<td>same PDF files + few more Word files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-MA English</td>
<td>More files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Agricultural Business</td>
<td>same PDF files + few more Word files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Computer Engineering</td>
<td>same PDF files + 1 more Word file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Computer Science</td>
<td>same PDF files + few more Word files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Economics</td>
<td>same PDF files + few more Word files;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>same PDF files + 1 more Word file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Engineering Sciences</td>
<td>same PDF files + few more Word files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS ERM Environmental Resource Management</td>
<td>same PDF files + more files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Kinesiology</td>
<td>same PDF files + few more Word files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Mathematics</td>
<td>same + 2 MOUAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Sociology</td>
<td>same + Sociology 2015 Folder in Archives folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS_MS Nursing</td>
<td>Same + Nursing 3-14-16 Folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Counseling Psych</td>
<td>Same + 2 more Word files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Natural Sciences</td>
<td>BS Natural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same PDF files + more Word/Excel files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BS Physics</th>
<th>BS Physics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>same + Physics 2015 Folder</td>
<td>No Physics 2015 Folder in Archives folder; Physics 2018-19 folder in Archives folder is empty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BS-MS Biology</th>
<th>BS-MS Biology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Admin</th>
<th>Business Admin (No folder)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same + More old files (1997-98, 2009-10 review cycle materials)</td>
<td>Folder of Business Admin in Completed Reviews folder.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BA-MPA PPA**

- same PDF files + few more Word files including UPRC Notification 1/15/2015

**BA-MPA in Public Administration (No folder)**

- but 1 file re UPRC Notification 1/15/2015 is included in BA-MPA PPA.

**PPA**

- Contains 3 PDF files ("NASPAA_Accred_2009," "Provost_Memo_2003," "UPRC PPA BAPA and MPA Program Reviews Memo2 2") and 1 Word file “PPA Response to UPRC Program Review Report, October 20, 20”), which are not available in BA-MPA PPA Folder;
- The other two Word files are in BA-MPA PPA Folder.

**Public Admin**

- Contains 2 folders:
  - 2018 External Report folder: includes 1 PDF file re UPRC Memo (5/14/2018) “UPRC Response BAPA MPA 2017 18,” which is not available in BA-MPA PPA Folder; the other three PDF files are in BA-MPA PPA Folder.
  - Archives folder includes more prior reviews info (1998-99; 2010-11; etc.)

Combine all folders into 1 folder.
### Completed Reviews (No Separate Folder)

There is a “Completed Reviews” folder in Archives (see above in Archives section).

**Email Attachments**

- **Folder: Administration** (see above)
- **Folder: Applied Studies** (see above)
- **Folder: BA History** (see below)
- **Folder: Business Administration** (see above)
- **Folder: Chemistry – Biochemistry** (see above)
- **Folder: Criminal Justice** (see below)
- **Folder: Educational Administration** (see below)
- **Folder: Educational Counseling** (see below)
- **Folder: Email Attachments** (contains two Word files: “CJ Review” (UPRC draft memo 2/6/2017) & “Communications” (UPRC notifying overdue Communications program review)
- **Folder: Global Intelligence & National Security** (see below)
- **Folder: Honors Program** (see below)
- **Folder: Human Biological Sciences** (see above in BA Human Biological Sciences folder in SharePoint)
- **Folder: Interdisciplinary Studies** (see below)
- **Folder: Philosophy** (see below)
- **Folder: Science Education** (see below)
- **Folder: Social Work** (see below)
- **Folder: Special Major Interdisciplinary Studies** (see below)
- **Folder: SPED** (see below)
- **Folder: Teacher Education** (see below)
- **File “Philosophy Program External Review 3”** (this file is available in Philosophy folder in BOX in 2015 Philosophy Program Review folder called “Philosophy Program External Review.”)

### Computer and Electrical Sciences (NO Folder)

- **a. In the folder of Reviews by Program – BS Computer Engineering**
- **b. In the folder of Reviews by Program – BS Electrical Engineering**
- **c. In the folder of Reviews by Program – BS Electrical Engineering**
- **d. In the folder of Reviews by Program – BS Engineering Sciences Supporting Documents folder**

- **Computer and Electrical Sciences**
  - Folder contains 4 files:
    - ABET Self study computer engineering-2017-18 self study report
    - ABET Self study Electrical Engineering-2017-18 self study report
    - Computer and electrical engineering final 11-16-2018Final2
    - Engineering Sciences extension

### Counseling MS:

- Contains 2 folders
  - 2005-06 Folder: Excel file “Counseling MS data master”
  - 2010-11 Folder:

- **MS Counseling**
  - Contains 2 files re extension approval

- **EDCS**
  - Contains 2015-16 review folder + other files

- Combine all folders into 1 folder

### Educational Counseling (No folder)

- Folder in Completed Reviews folder
- Contains 2 files: “EDCS Self study-Fall 15” & “EDCS-PR Memo 2”

### Criminal Justice

- **Same + More**
- No UPRC Draft Memo (2/6/2017) which is available in SharePoint called “CJ Review.”

### Criminal Justice (No folder)

- In Completed Reviews folder
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU Accredited Programs by campus</td>
<td>Contains 1 Word file: CSU accredited programs by Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Intelligence and National Security</td>
<td>Same + few more Word files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Same + More (including info re prior reviews 1998-99, 2006-07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Program</td>
<td>MORE files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary MA</td>
<td>Same + few more files in 2003-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Major-Inter Studies</td>
<td>Contains 1 Word File “InterStudies Review Notification,” which is available in Interdisciplinary MA Folder – Archives folder – Interdis 2014-15 folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Education C and I</td>
<td>More + MA Education folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages &amp; Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS-Health Care Administration</td>
<td>More + Archives folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Same + MORE (including info re prior reviews 1996-97, 2003-04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>Same + 1 Word file “UPRCReviewNoteScienceEducation”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>No folder. 2015-16 Social Work Folder is in BA Sociology folder in Archives Folder. Combine the 2015-16 Social Work folder in BOX and Social Work folder in SharePoint. Create a separate folder in BOX with the above information included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work (NO folder)</td>
<td>In Completed Reviews folder. Has more files.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1 PDF file + Special Education 2016 folder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED</td>
<td>no Special Education 2016 folder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED (NO folder)</td>
<td>In Completed Reviews folder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>More. But the following 2 are not in Box, which are available in SharePoint: “S Schmidt MEMO dtd 11-16-16” “Stacey letter 11-15-16”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education (NO folder)</td>
<td>In Completed Reviews folder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRC Grid</td>
<td>Folder called “UPRC Grid 2019-2020.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRC Grid (NO folder)</td>
<td>Folder called “UPRC Grid”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRC Meeting Agenda-Minutes</td>
<td>Folder called “Meeting Agenda-Minutes 2019-2020,” 114 files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRC Members</td>
<td>5 files.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members and Term Limits</td>
<td>No Folder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 files; 2016-2017 UPRC membership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| UPRC Letterhead | Folder called “UPRC Official-LH-6-4-19,” 1 Word File | Folder called “UPRC Letterhead,” including:  
- 2016 Letterhead Folder (4 Word files) and  
- 1 Word File for UPRC-Letterhead-6-4-19 |
| UPRC Review Cycle 2019 | 2 files + 1 Outlook Item |  |
| UPRC Workshops | • UPRC Workshop 2017: 20 items  
• UPRC Workshop 2018: 21 items  
• UPRC Workshop Fall 2019: 10 items  
• UPRC Workshop Spring 2019: 1 item  
• Thumbs |  |
| Important Communications | NO folder | Folder empty |
| Other | • Two files: .DS Store and Thumbs | Other files:  
- English letter revised_updated_02_12_2018  
- O365 Groups – QRG  
- Preparing a winning self-study1  
- Program review roster  
- UPRC Workshops Feb 2018 |
Appendix 3: Issues of Concern in Academic Program Review at CSUB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPRC Recommendations/Issues of Concern</th>
<th>AY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016-2017; 2011-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Program Review Template and MOUAP Template need to be reviewed and reaffirmed by the Academic Senate.*</td>
<td>2019-2020; 2018-2019; 2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of assessing student learning outcomes*</td>
<td>2019-2020; 2018-2019; 2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting the information on undergraduate and graduate programs separately and clearly in the self-studies*</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring programs have sufficient notice for preparing their Self-Study and Program Plan</td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying attention to program sustainability*</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning External Reviewer visits in advance*</td>
<td>2017-2018; 2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving accredited programs in the university program review process</td>
<td>2016-2017; 2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of UPRC</td>
<td>2016-2017; 2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Annual Report process</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of deans</td>
<td>2016-2017; 2011-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising program review template</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of program and department</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The list of issues of concern in academic program review at CSUB was compiled based on archived UPRC reports (AY 2010-2011 – AY 2019-2020); UPRC reports for AY 2013-2014 and AY 2015-2016 are not available.
2. Recommendations marked with an asteroid were identified by the UPRC in their poster presentation with the WSCUC Team.
Appendix 4: Academic Program Review at CSUs – Information on the Website

Bakersfield
1. https://www.csub.edu/academicprograms/Program%20Review/index.html
2. Every 7 years
3. Available on the website:
   a. Academic Program Review Policy and Procedures (Spring 2010)
   c. Academic Program Annual Reports
   d. Program Review Progress Report
   e. University Program Review Schedule
   f. University Program Review Committee

Channel Islands
1. https://www.csuci.edu/continuousimprovement/program-review.htm
2. 5-year cycle
3. Available on the website:
   a. Program Review Process
   b. Program Review Schedule
   c. Program Review Guidelines

Chico
1. https://www.csuchico.edu/apr/
3. Once every 5 years
4. Separate undergraduate and graduate program reviews
5. Available on the website:
   a. Undergraduate programs
      i. Undergrad Academic Program Review Guidelines
      ii. Undergrad External Review Process and Guide
      iii. APR Funding
      iv. Undergrad Program Review Schedule
   b. Graduate programs
      i. Graduate Academic Program Review Guidelines
      ii. Graduate External Review Process and Guide
      iii. APR Funding
      iv. Graduate Program Review Schedule

Dominguez Hills
1. https://www.csudh.edu/uepa/program-review/
2. Every 6 years
3. Available on the website:
   a. Goals of academic program review
b. Program Review Schedule  
c. Program Review Guide  
d. Program Review Panel Charge  
e. Program Review Panel Roster  
f. Program Review Panel Meeting Minutes (2016-17)  
g. Past Program Review Summary Agreements

**East Bay**  
1. [https://www.csueastbay.edu/senate/five-year-review.html](https://www.csueastbay.edu/senate/five-year-review.html)  
2. [https://www.csueastbay.edu/senate/committees/capr/index.html](https://www.csueastbay.edu/senate/committees/capr/index.html)  
3. Every 5 years  
4. Available on the website:  
   a. Academic Program Review Procedures  
   b. Annual Report deadlines  
   c. Annual Report Template & Checklist  
   d. External Reviewer Request Form  
   e. 19-20 Five-Year Program Review Schedule  
   f. Five-year Program Review Archives by Department (including 5-year reviews, CAPR Review Documents, and MOUs)  
   g. Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR) Committee Information: Committee Policies & Procedures  
   h. Subcommittees of CAPR  
   i. 2020-21 CAPR Members  
   j. CAPR Meeting Archive (including meeting agendas and minutes from 1999-2020)

5. **Academic Program Review Procedures:**  
   [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1IF7nNAybb3LzAnGFnn0myCg7htGt2PYI/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1IF7nNAybb3LzAnGFnn0myCg7htGt2PYI/view)  
6. **CAPR Committee Policies & Procedures (CAPR Charge):**  
   [https://docs.google.com/document/d/16t5vMmW98kib8g0askhM4m_QLc9CUMIlj_PTLXND-DeU/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/16t5vMmW98kib8g0askhM4m_QLc9CUMIlj_PTLXND-DeU/edit)

**Fresno**  
1. University Committee Review: [https://www.fresnostate.edu/academics/curriculum/prog-review/](https://www.fresnostate.edu/academics/curriculum/prog-review/)  
   Undergraduate Curriculum Committee:  
   University Graduate Committee:  
   [http://www.fresnostate.edu/academics/senate/committees/graduate/index.html](http://www.fresnostate.edu/academics/senate/committees/graduate/index.html)  
2. 5-year cycle  
3. Available on the website:  
   a. Procedures & Guidelines for Review of Academic Programs  
   b. Abbreviated Program Review for Nationally Accredited Programs  
   c. Forms and Templates (Orientation, Self-Study Template, Review Team Report, & Action Plan)  
   d. Academic Program Review Schedule (by college)

4. **Data in Undergraduate Program Review Packet (Fall 2013):**  
5. **Data in Graduate Program Review Packet (Fall 2019):**  
**Fullerton**

1. [http://www.fullerton.edu/data/quality/ppr/](http://www.fullerton.edu/data/quality/ppr/)
2. Every 7 years
3. Available on the website:
   a. University Policy Statement on Program Performance Review (PPR)
   b. PPR Guidelines
   c. PPR Schedule 2020-2021 through 2026-2027 by Year and by Program
   d. PPR Reports by College (Programs)
4. **PPR Schedule 2020-2021 through 2026-2027 by Year**:
   [http://www.fullerton.edu/data/_resources/pdfs/ppr/PPR_Schedule_Y_050820.pdf](http://www.fullerton.edu/data/_resources/pdfs/ppr/PPR_Schedule_Y_050820.pdf)
5. **PPR Schedule 2020-2021 through 2026-2027 by Program**:
   [http://www.fullerton.edu/data/_resources/pdfs/ppr/PPR_Schedule_P_050820.pdf](http://www.fullerton.edu/data/_resources/pdfs/ppr/PPR_Schedule_P_050820.pdf)

**Humboldt**

1. [https://academicprograms.humboldt.edu/content/program-review-documents](https://academicprograms.humboldt.edu/content/program-review-documents) (need password to log in to view program review documents.)
   [https://ie.humboldt.edu/Assessments/AcademicAssessment](https://ie.humboldt.edu/Assessments/AcademicAssessment)
   [https://ie.humboldt.edu/Assessments](https://ie.humboldt.edu/Assessments) (This website is currently under construction. A new Assessment and Program Review website will be up in Summer 2020.)
2. 6-year cycle
3. Available on the website ([https://ie.humboldt.edu/Assessments/AcademicAssessment](https://ie.humboldt.edu/Assessments/AcademicAssessment)):
   a. Program Review Schedule by Year and by Program
   b. Timeline of Review Year
   c. Self-Study Template
   d. External Review: Logistics and Template

**Long Beach**

1. [https://www.csulb.edu/academic-senate/program-assessment-review-council-parc](https://www.csulb.edu/academic-senate/program-assessment-review-council-parc)
2. Every 7 years
3. Available on the website:
   a. Charge of the Program Assessment and Review Council (PARC), membership, committees, subcommittees
   b. Committee meeting schedule
   c. Links to documents
   f. Council Duties
   g. Assessments
4. **Academic Senate Policy on Program Review:**

**Los Angeles**
1. [http://www.calstatela.edu/apra/program-review](http://www.calstatela.edu/apra/program-review)
2. Every 6 years
3. Available on the website
   - Policy on program review
   - Program review schedule (by college/program)
   - Program review subcommittee (current members)
   - Program review resources: [http://www.calstatela.edu/apra/program-review-resources](http://www.calstatela.edu/apra/program-review-resources)
     i. Templates
        1. Program Review Self-study Template
        3. Modified Self-Study Report Matrix (for externally accredited programs)
        4. Comprehensive Assessment Plan Template
   ii. Program Review Workshop Materials
      1. Program Review Workshop I: Orientation for Self-study process
      2. Program Review Workshop: Modified Self Study
      3. Program Review Workshop: Data Pull
      4. Program Review Workshop III: Meaningful Assessment

**Maritime Academy**
2. Curriculum Committee of Academic Senate: [https://www.csum.edu/web/academic-senate-community/curriculum-committee/index.html](https://www.csum.edu/web/academic-senate-community/curriculum-committee/index.html)
   a. Curriculum Committee Policies & Procedures regarding academic program review: [https://www.csum.edu/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=db84e12b-fa04-4c14-a2de-d28d2d7f8b7b&groupId=3965808.html.pdf](https://www.csum.edu/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=db84e12b-fa04-4c14-a2de-d28d2d7f8b7b&groupId=3965808.html.pdf)
3. Every 5-6 years
4. Available on the website
   a. Annual Learning Results (by program)
   b. Program Review (by programs)

**Monterey Bay**
1. [https://csumb.edu/academicaffairs/program-review-0](https://csumb.edu/academicaffairs/program-review-0)
2. 7-year cycle
3. Available on the website
   a. Overview of Academic Program Review
   c. Academic Program Review Schedule (by college/program)
   d. Program Review Process
Northridge
1. https://www.csun.edu/assessment-and-program-review/program-review
2. 7-year cycle
3. Available on the website
   a. Overview of Academic Program Review (including purpose and flowchart of program review process)
   b. Programs currently in program review process
   c. Quick links to MOU Scholar Works Collection
   d. Quick links to AAPR A to Z (program review procedures & policy, self-study guidelines, guidelines for external review).

Pomona
2. Every 5 years
3. Available on the website
   a. Program review schedule by year/college
   b. Program review process and responsible parties
   c. Program review resources: Department, external review, dean, sample data, and WASC resources

Sacramento
1. https://www.csus.edu/academic-affairs/academic-excellence/
2. 6-year cycle
3. Available on the website
   a. Academic Program Review Policy
   b. Program review process and responsible parties:
   c. University Program Review Manual

San Bernardino
1. https://www.csusb.edu/academic-programs/program-review/program-review-resources
2. Every 7 years
3. Available on the website
   a. Program Review policy
   b. Academic Master Plan 2020-21 through 2029-30
   c. Program Review Report Templates (Dean’s report template, external review report template, University Program Review Committee Report template, Department action plan template)

San Diego
1. https://assessment.sdsu.edu/
2. 5-7 years
3. Available on the website
   a. No information about academic program review
b. Information about program assessment (Student Learning Outcomes Committee, Program Assessment Rubric, Program Assessment Primer, etc.)

San Francisco
1. [https://ueap.sfsu.edu/content/acaplan/program_review/home](https://ueap.sfsu.edu/content/acaplan/program_review/home)
2. Currently in 7th cycle. A cycle of program review is complete when all colleges have undergone review.
3. Available on the website
   a. Handbook and Guidelines for the Seventh Cycle of Academic Program Review
   b. Seventh Cycle
      i. Cohort 4 (2019-2020, 8 programs)
      ii. Cohort 3 (2018-2019, 7 programs)
      iii. Completed 7th Cycle Program Review: including links to each program’s self study, external review, response to external review, Concluding Action Memo
         1. Cohort 2 (2017-2018, 10 programs)
         2. Cohort 1 (2016-2017, 7 programs)
   c. Academic Program Review Resources
      i. Seventh cycle academic program review process
      ii. Overview of high impact practices files
      iii. Table templates
4. [Academic Program Review Process](https://ueap.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/assets/program_review/7th_cycle_process_%281%29.pdf)

San Jose
1. [https://www.sjsu.edu/gup/ugs/faculty/programplanning/index.html](https://www.sjsu.edu/gup/ugs/faculty/programplanning/index.html)
2. Every 7 years
3. Available on the website
   a. University Policy on Program Planning
   b. Planning process (each step, program planning guidelines and templates, program planning checklist)
   c. Support resources for process (program planning release time request, submission and communications, extension requests)
   d. Other useful resources (links to Program Assessment webpage, Program Records webpage, WASC rubrics, University Learning Goals, Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA) website, list of High Impact practices, Program Planning workshop, Guidelines for Concentrations)
4. [Program Planning template for accredited programs](https://www.sjsu.edu/gup/ugs/faculty/programplanning/index.html)
5. [Program Planning Extension Requests](https://www.sjsu.edu/gup/docs/PP/SJSU_ProgramPlan_ExtensionRequestForm.pdf)

San Luis Obispo
1. [https://academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/program-review](https://academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/program-review)
2. 7-year cycle
3. Available on the website
   a. Academic program review process (self-review and peer-review)
b. Documents and templates (templates for undergraduate and graduate self-study, reviewer nomination form, sample site visit itinerary, action plan template, program review checklist)

San Marcos
2. 5- or 7-year cycle
3. Available on the website
   a. Schedule of program reviews
   b. Program review policy and guidelines
   c. Process flow chart
   d. Process timeline
   e. External reviewers guide
   f. Support documents for program review (program data notebook, self-study report template, link to Institutional Planning & Analytics)

Sonoma
1. https://academicaffairs.sonoma.edu/academic-programs/program-review
2. 5-year cycle
3. Available on the website
   a. Program Review Workshop Spring 2020
   b. Program Review Timeline
   c. Program Review Policy
   d. Self-study process guidelines
   e. External review
   f. Next steps: University Program Review Subcommittee
   g. Program review schedule (including links to some programs’ self-study and external review)

Stanislaus
1. https://www.csustan.edu/office-assessment/academic-program-review
2. Every 7 years
3. Available on the website
   a. APR Procedures, Schedule, and Timeline (links to APR Schedule and Timeline)
   b. Academic Program Review Self-Study (links to Self-Study Template, Institutional Dashboards, CSU Student Success Dashboard)
   c. APR Internal and External Review (links to sample college APR review criteria, Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee feedback form, GE Areas and Outcomes Alignment, Guidelines for Graduate Council Evaluation)
   d. Closing the Loop (links to Dept Implementation Plan, Provost Memo, Archives of Academic Program Review Assessment and Presentations)

4. Presentation: 7-year Academic Program Review Cycle:
   https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/AcademicPrograms/Data/documents/Seven_Year_AP_R_cycle.pdf

Note: Those marked yellow are best practices that may provide helpful information for improving academic program review at CSUB.
Appendix 5: Program Review Best Practices – Interviews with other CSUs

A. Interview Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>Interviewee(s)</th>
<th>Time of Zoom Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>Dr. Maureen Scharberg: Associate Provost for Academic Resources &amp; Planning</td>
<td>7/15/2020 9am-10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Dr. Bernadette Muscat: Undergraduate Program Review Officer; Interim Dean, Undergraduate Studies Office Dr. James Marshall: Graduate Program Review Officer; Dean, Division of Research and Graduate Studies</td>
<td>7/9/2020 9am-10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>Dr. Sharlene Sayegh: Director of Program Review and Assessment; Accreditation Liaison Officer</td>
<td>7/9/2020 10am-11am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Dr. Karin Elliott Brown: Associate Vice President and Dean of Graduate Studies; Accreditation Liaison Officer</td>
<td>7/13/2020 3pm-4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Dr. Jane Dewitt: Associate Dean of Academic Planning</td>
<td>7/9/2020 11am-12pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Dr. Thalia Anagnos: Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>7/8/2020 1pm-2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>Dr. Katie Olivant: Interim AVP for Academic Affairs Erin Littlepage: Student Success and Community Partnerships Specialist; assessment guru</td>
<td>7/8/2020 2pm-3pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Interview Questions: Targeted Questions

1. East Bay:
   a. CAPR Charge: https://docs.google.com/document/d/16t5vMmW98kb8g0ashhM4m_QLe9CUMIi_PTLXND_DeU/edit
   b. Academic Program Review Procedures: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1IF7nNAybb3LzAnGFnn0myCg7htGt2PYI/view

2. Fresno

3. Long Beach
   a. Comprehensive

4. Los Angeles

5. San Francisco
a. Academic Program Review Process:
https://ueap.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/assets/program_review/7th_cycle_process_%281%29.pdf

6. San Jose
   a. Program Planning template for accredited programs:
      https://www.sjsu.edu/gup/ugs/faculty/programplanning/index.html
   b. Program Planning Extension Requests:
      https://www.sjsu.edu/gup/docs/PP/SJSU_ProgramPlan_ExtensionRequestForm.pdf

7. Stanislaus
   a. Presentation: 7-year Academic Program Review Cycle:
      https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/AcademicPrograms/Data/documents/Seven_Year_APR_cycle.pdf

C. Interview Questions: General Questions

1. What happens if a program (or a responsible party) is recalcitrant about participating in the review?
2. Which part of the program review process takes most time and effort? How do you address it?
3. What are the best practices in your program review process that are especially helpful?
4. What changes have had the most positive impact on the program review process? What changes would make your review process more effective?
5. Is there any other information in the program review process you consider important?
### Appendix 6: Proposed Recommendations for Improving Academic Program Review at CSUB

Academic program review is a faculty-driven, outcomes-based, collaborative, integrated, and continuous process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues of Concern in Program Review</th>
<th>Recommended Changes</th>
<th>Responsible Constituencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance of the Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of assessing student learning outcomes</td>
<td>Have regular training workshops on assessment</td>
<td>Faculty, Assessment Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of UPRC</td>
<td>Select UPRC members as soon as possible</td>
<td>Faculty, Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing and reaffirming Program Review Template</td>
<td>Finalize and approve program review template</td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing and reaffirming MOUAP Template</td>
<td>Finalize and approve MOUAP template</td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring programs have sufficient notice for preparing their Self-Study and Program Plan</td>
<td>Develop and maintain a realistic program review timeline, and affirm adherence to it</td>
<td>UPRC; Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving accredited programs in the university program review process</td>
<td>Establish a modified program review process for accredited programs</td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Senate, Faculty of Accredited Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Annual Report process</td>
<td>Develop a flowchart to integrate annual reports into program reviews</td>
<td>UPRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of deans</td>
<td>Ask deans to comment on self-study, program plan, external review report, and UPRC report</td>
<td>Faculty, Deans, Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing self-studies and program plans in a timely fashion</td>
<td>Develop a program review dashboard</td>
<td>UPRC, IRPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting the information on undergraduate and graduate programs separately and clearly in the self-studies</td>
<td>Select and post sample program reviews online</td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning External Reviewer visits in advance</td>
<td>Submit a list of potential external reviewers with program reviews</td>
<td>Faculty, Deans, Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post External Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing MOUAPs in a timely fashion</td>
<td>Use MOUAPs as the basis for resource allocation</td>
<td>Faculty, Deans, Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation and Reporting of Program Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repository of program review documents</td>
<td>Better organize and archive program review documents</td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting program review documents</td>
<td>Determine what program review information is posted online and update the website accordingly</td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:

1. Some of the recommended changes have already been proposed and/or implemented.
2. See, as an example, the Provost’s Statement in the Concluding Action Memo at San Francisco State (document obtained through email correspondence):
   “The program review process should serve as a basis for strategic planning, including curricular changes, development of new courses, hiring plans, resource requests, and space allocation. Future proposals that affect any of these aspects of the program/department should refer to program review documents, including this concluding action memo.”
3. See, as an example, the Program Performance Review Schedule: 2020-2021 through 2026-2027 by Program at CSU Fullerton (retrieved June 12, 2020, from http://www.fullerton.edu/data/_resources/pdfs/ppr/PPR_Schedule_P_050820.pdf).
4. See, as an example, the Program Plan Extension Request form at San Jose State (retrieved July 1, 2020, from https://www.sjsu.edu/gup/docs/PP/SJSU_ProgramPlan_ExtensionRequestForm.pdf).
5. See, as an example, the Modified Self-Study Report Matrix (for externally accredited programs) at CSU Los Angeles (retrieved June 12, 2020, from http://www.calstatela.edu/apra/program-review-resources).
6. See, as an example, the Seven-Year Academic Program Review Cycle at CSU Stanislaus (retrieved June 30, 2020, from https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/AcademicPrograms/Data/documents/Seven_Year_APR_cycle.pdf).
7. See, as an example, Dean’s Report Template at CSU San Bernardino (retrieved June 30, 2020, from https://www.csusb.edu/academic-programs/program-review/program-review-resources).
9. See, as an example, sample Self-Studies, MOUAPs, and other program review information posted on the Program Assessment & Review Council’s website at CSU Long Beach (retrieved June 11, 2020, from https://www.csulb.edu/academic-senate/program-assessment-review-council-parc).
10. See Appendix 7 for recommendations on how to organize program review documents.
Appendix 7: Recommendations for Organizing Program Review Documents

- Program Review Policies, Procedures, and Templates (by year)
  - CSU Policies
  - CSUB Policies, Procedures, and Templates
    - Program Review Policies
    - Program Review Procedures
    - Self-Study and Program Plan Templates
    - External Reviewer Visit Templates (invitation letter, itinerary, external reviewer report, etc.)
    - Dean’s Review Templates
    - MOUAP Templates
    - Annual Report Templates
    - Program Review Progress Report Template
    - Task Forces
    - Other Changes/Reforms/Recommendations

- UPRC Membership (by year)
- UPRC Meeting Agendas and Minutes (by year)
  - Agendas
  - Minutes
- UPRC Grid (by year)
- UPRC Workshops (by year)
- UPRC Annual Report to Senate (by year)
- UPRC Miscellaneous (by year)
  - UPRC Letterhead
  - Welcome Letters
  - Thank-You Letters
  - Other
- Program Reviews (by program/year)
  - Self-Study and Program Plan
  - External Reviewer Report
  - Program Response to External Reviewer Report
  - Dean’s Report
  - Program Response to Dean’s Report
  - UPRC Report
  - MOUAP
  - Program Review Progress Report
  - UPRC Correspondence with Programs
  - Other
- Annual Reports (by program/department/year)
- Other
Appendix 8: Proposed Survey of Program Directors/Department Chairs

Appendix 8A: Introduction

Dear Colleagues,

Thank you very much for taking time off your busy schedule to participate in this survey! The purpose of this survey is to get your perspectives of the academic program review process, so we can incorporate them in the program review revision at CSUB and best assist you with your next program review.

The survey consists of 12 questions and takes approximately 20 minutes to complete. Should you have any questions or concerns about the survey, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you!

Appendix 8B: Survey Questions

Your Name:
Your Title:
Name of Program(s):

1. When was your last program review?

2. In writing your program’s self-study and program plan
   a. Who was the lead person?
   b. Did that person receive any release time or stipend in completing the program review report?
   c. How long did it take to complete the self-study and program plan?
   d. What are the major challenges you experienced, and how did you address them?
   e. What do you think will better help you complete the next self-study and program plan?

3. Regarding the external reviewer visit,
   a. What are the challenges you experienced in scheduling the last external reviewer visit?
   b. How was the external reviewer visit (including the exit meeting with the external reviewer)?
   c. How long did it take for you to receive the external reviewer’s report?
   d. How beneficial was the external reviewer’s report in evaluating your program(s) and addressing your programmatic needs?
   e. What do you think will make your next external reviewer visit more successful?

4. Working with the UPRC,
   a. How helpful was the UPRC workshop in planning and writing your self-study and program plan?
   b. How frequent did you receive UPRC reminders?
   c. What do you think of the UPRC memo/report on your program’s self-study and program plan?
   d. What challenges did you experience in working with the UPRC on your program review?
   e. How do you think can the UPRC better assist you with your next program review?
5. In completing the MOUAP,
   a. What challenges did you experience in drafting the MOUAP?
   b. Who was involved in drafting the MOUAP?
   c. How long did it take to complete the draft MOUAP?
   d. What do you think of the MOUAP meeting with the dean, Academic Programs, the Provost, and others?
   e. From drafting to signing the MOUAP, how long did it take to complete the process?
   f. What would you recommend making the MOUAP process more efficient and effective?

6. Working on the annual report,
   a. When was the last time you completed and submitted the annual program report?
   b. What happened after you submitted the annual report? Did you receive any feedback from your dean and other colleagues?
   c. Was the annual report helpful with the program review process?
   d. What would you recommend making the annual report process more relevant to the program review?

7. Was your Department/Program assessment coordinator helpful with student learning assessment in completing your program review? How can the Department/Program assessment coordinator better assist you?

8. Was the School Assessment Coordinator helpful with student learning assessment in completing your program review? How can the School Assessment Coordinator better assist you?

9. During your last program review cycle, what did you get the most of it?

10. What do you think is the best part of your last program review process?

11. What do you think is most frustrating part of your last program review process?

12. Do you have any suggestions for improving the program review and annual report process at CSUB?

Thank you for your participation! We appreciate your insights!
Appendix 9: Proposed Survey of Deans/Associate Deans

Appendix 9A: Introduction

Dear Colleagues,

Thank you very much for taking time off your busy schedule to participate in this survey! The purpose of this survey is to get your perspectives of the academic program review process, so we can incorporate them in the program review revision at CSUB and make it more efficient and effective.

The survey consists of 10 questions and takes approximately 10 minutes to complete. Should you have any questions or concerns about the survey, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you!

Appendix 9B: Survey Questions

Your Name:
Your Title:

1. When was the last program review in your school you were involved with? What is the name of the program that was reviewed?

2. What was your role in your school’s last program review? What specific activities did you partake in your school’s last program review?

3. Did the Dean’s Office provide any release time or stipend to the lead person(s) of the program review?

4. How was your experience with the external reviewer? What do you think of the external reviewer’s report?

5. How was your experience of the MOUAP process?

6. What challenges did you experience in your school’s last program review? How did you address them?

7. What is most frustrating part of your school’s last program review process?

8. What do you think is the best part of your school’s last program review process?

9. How does the annual program/department report process work in your school? What is your role in the process? How useful and effective is the annual report process in your school?

10. Do you have any suggestions for improving the program review and annual report process at CSUB?

Thank you for your participation! We appreciate your insights!