ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda
Tuesday, November 17, 2020
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
Videoconference

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK
   Campus Counsel – K. Bendell (Time Certain 10:15)

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   November 10, 2020 Minutes

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Time Certain 10:05)

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. Ally Software timing
   f. Zoom Lecture Recordings

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. Elections and Appointments (handout)
      i. School Elections Committees
      ii. Committee proliferation
   b. UPRC Changes (handout)
   c. APM Proposal – GECCo (handout)
   d. FYS Instructors and GECCo structure (handout)
   e. EEGO course offerings – Summer Term
   f. Post-Tenure Review Requirements
   g. Handbook 306.2.2.e (handout)
   h. Campus Data Needs
i. Syllabi Accessibility (handout)

j. Alma Mater

k. Faculty Poll regarding online instruction

l. Sabbatical Application Procedures

m. URC Recommendations (handout)

n. Proposal for creation of a Department of Ethnic Studies (handout)

o. AMP 2020-21 through 2029-30 (handout)

p. Fall 2020 graduation

q. Campus Climate Committee (handout)

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING NOVEMBER 19, 2020** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)

   Announcements
   President Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10)

   Approval of Agenda (Time Certain 10:05)

   Reports

   Resolutions

   Consent Agenda

   New Business

   Old Business

   RES 202110 Academic Calendar Fall ’20 Spring ’21 Fall ’21 Spring ‘22 Summer ‘22

   RES 202111 Graduate Student Grievances and Appeals

   Open Forum and Wellness Check (Time Certain 11:15)

   Past Senate Chair, Vandana Kohli (Time Certain 11:20)

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

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

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK**  
   • There were political jokes and social media moments shared which served as a wellness check on members’ state of mind. A healthy sense of humor was present.  
   • Political Science department is doing an election analysis event today.  
   • The Board of Trustees (BOT) meets on November 17 and 18. In CSUB’s draft resolution opposing the CO implementation of AB 1460, the first resolve is the recommendation that the BOT rescind their July 2020 Title V changes. There are 15 or more CSU campuses that have similar resolutions in opposition.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
   M. Rees clarified the discussion regarding late nominations for awards. C. Lam moved to approve the November 3, 2020 Minutes as amended. R. Gearhart seconded. Approved as amended.

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Time Certain 10:05)**  
   A. Hegde proposed adding a draft Resolution CSUB Academic Senate Opposition to AB 1460 Implementation Plan to NEW DISCUSSION. M. Rees requested that two topics be added: Alma Mater, and Faculty Poll. B. Street moved to approve the agenda as amended. C. Lam seconded. Approved by a show of hands.

5. **CONTINUED ITEMS**  
   a. **AS Log (handout)**  
      i. AAC (R. Gearhart) the committee made the changes to RES 202109 Changes to the GE Breadth Requirement – Ethnic Studies. They briefly discussed Referral #9 Expanded Winter Session. B. Street offered to share and get involved in discussion of Expanded Winter Session when
asked by AAC. R. Gearhart said that M. Novak is doing a survey. He is invited to AAC December 10. If Winter Session is expanded, it would start before the Fall grades are due, and Spring Session would start before Winter grades were due. There would be issues with administrative drops and other things were students might think they can take courses or sign-up for multiple sections if they think they are failing, etc. The AAC also began discussion of Referral 10 Course Repetition.

ii. AS&SS (C. Lam) – The entire meeting was used to complete discussion on Graduate Student Grievances and Appeals in preparation of presenting a resolution at the Senate meeting. They included forms.

iii. FAC (M. Rees) Referral 2019-2020 # 8 Honorary Doctorate – Handbook Change – the committee felt there was a good policy, yet it wasn’t being followed. Why were the President and Trustees moving nominations forth without checking with faculty? A. Hegde discussed it with the President. She’s on board with how the EC sees the process and her role and the role of faculty in looking at the nominations before they go forward. Referral 2020-2021 # 8 Notification to Chairs of Assigned Time. Perhaps the timing of Senate elections can be changed. A. Hegde recommended that item be covered under NEW DISCUSSION, Elections and Appointments.

iv. BPC (B. Street) The session was devoted to calendar discussion and the committee’s approval of RES 202112. He will clarify that Fall 20 changed because of the time crunch and that the EC had to approve the change fast.

b. Provost’s Update – V. Harper

i. Instructional Plan Spring 2021 – The Provost thanked all faculty and department chairs who worked hard on it. It is going to be approved at the President’s level. The CO plays a lesser role this cycle. Upon the President’s approval, V. Harper will communicate those classes that have been approved.

ii. GRaSP – a memo on its future forthcoming. It is a captured position. The Provost will oversee that unit. The SPA Board meets soon. Thanks to I. Ebong for all he has done.

iii. The Pandemic Research Group will be announced shortly. Thanks to everyone who has gotten on board with that project.

iv. Legislative visits are this week. There are many sessions scheduled with the legislative staffers.
Academic Affairs is building a great team and that required some changes. Every administrator needs to row in the same direction. The team needs to be organized and in concert with faculty in the right direction.

c. Searches – V. Harper
   i. Dean Library – the last candidate has been interviewed. The Council will be working with the consultant and reaching a decision soon.
   ii. NSME Permanent Dean Search – It’s moving very well. He and the consultant conversed last week. The position is an important one for our institution. Attracting the best candidates is critical.
   iii. AVP AA Dean of Academic Programs – The committee has been charged. Position description to be completed in the next couple weeks.
   iv. AVP Faculty Affairs – The search begins in the Spring 2021.
   v. Dean AV - The search begins in Spring 2021.
   vi. Interim IRPA – M. Malhotra starts December 1. A. Hegde will be inviting her to the December 8 EC extra meeting. V. Harper has added the meeting to her onboarding plan.

d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – Pandemic Budget Task Force (PBTF) - A. Hegde, D. Boschini, M. Rees and B. Street are on the task force. D. Boschini provided an update. The group process is past forming, past storming and now norming. It’s difficult to make cuts. Priorities are being identified. It raises questions as to why things are the way they are. Faculty travel will be going away. Not all faculty received travel support in the past. People can be successful without travel support. As a trend for the future, travel and printing are a target for savings and sustainability. The task force is looking at class caps and class sizes. There are different things being looked at for different schools. The task force recommends that schools determine appropriate cuts at the department level. Perhaps consolidate lecturer positions so there are less benefits being paid to fewer individuals. B. Street agreed with assessment. There was consensus against cuts in advising and release time for chairs. M. Rees said there were certain comments that were said about Advising coming from one school. Some schools feel there can be too many advisors and others not enough. That’s where the flexibility with cuts in schools is important because situations are different. R. Gearhart asked if faculty travel will be cut permanently. It could have unintended consequences of reducing our talent pool. M Rees replied it’s assumed to be temporary for the next two years. V. Harper intends the cuts to be for a 24-month period. Engage Deans how to implement the PBTF’s recommendations.
e. Ally Software – V. Harper asked the EC to weigh in on the program. A. Hegde said the issue is whether the software is turned on by default or we have faculty opt-in. It’s to have digital files accessible. M. Danforth recommended that the ad hoc ATI Instructional Materials team be formalized into a committee and they be charged as a multiple stakeholder committee. The membership to include certain administrators, staff, students, SSD, Library, and faculty for local knowledge. FTLC can have workshop on what Ally is and what it does. M. Danforth said last year ATI discussed that Ally would begin as a pilot. She will share ATI’s report with the EC. V. Harper said the cost paid by CO may influence timing of Ally software adoption.

f. Zoom Lecture Recordings – M. Danforth has scheduled a speaker for senior project. The speaker works for a national lab and is only authorized to speak on the condition that the meeting would not be recorded. The Zoom recording policy will affect our speaker pools and student experience. V. Harper shared the letter from the CO, signed by Willie Hugh, Office of General Counsel. They are “…directing all campuses to take steps to preserve all instruction Zoom content from Spring 2020 term forward that is or will be stored on the Zoom cloud. Specifically, for the time being, CSUB should remove the delete capability for users in Zoom.” M. Danforth said it sounds like this is saying to just remove the ability to delete. It does not say something must be recorded. A. Hegde sees from the administrative side for the system and for the whole campus that the ability to delete will be removed. On the faculty side, we have to start recording. R. Gearhart noted that the CO’s letter says that faculty does not have to change their practice regarding recording and that contradicts what we’re being advised locally to do. V. Harper said we should start recording. J. Millar asked ASCSU AA about it, voicing concerns which were discussed in EC November 3 on whether advising is considered instructional content that must be recorded. She received a letter from AVC A. Wrynn stating that any instruction that is recorded is subject to legal hold and faculty is not mandated to record anything. M. Martinez observed that the ASCSU is not quite sure how to interpret this. He raised the issue of storing lectures securely. Banking and other institutions lose data and they have very sophisticated security. Can CSU protect the stored recordings? People may look what was said in class, take it out of context, and then issue a lawsuit. Does the system have the funds to protect faculty in a lawsuit? V. Harper’s understanding that the removal of delete capability is immediate. In Spring 21, everything will be recorded. The Provost will conduct an open forum. K. Bendell and F. Gorham will be present to answer questions. Unless things change, we will be recording all Zoom meetings.
sought all recordings. The letter creates ambiguity, but there is no ambiguity from counsel to the Provosts. M. Danforth asked about auto record Spring 2021. If we do, it opens us to all kind of liability. Preserve on the cloud and clarify if taking steps to preserve recordings also means automatically recording all lectures. The memo does not state automatic recording in Spring 2021. A. Hegde requested that the members draft questions and concerns and highlight areas of the letter and then send to V. Harper. It will give him an opportunity to discuss with local counsel, K. Bendell, and CO General Counsel, W. Hugh be ready for the open forum. There is obvious disconnect so get questions lined up. The EC will submit feedback to the Provost and go from there.

6. **NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS**
   
   a. **RES 202112 CSUB Academic Senate Opposition to the Chancellor’s Office AB 1460 Implementation Plan** - A. Hegde said it is similar what 15 CSU Academic Senates have produced. The first resolve is a recommendation that BOT rescind changes made to Title V in July. (The BOT will be revisiting that in November.) The second resolve opposes AB 1460 implementation. CSUB is in solidarity with 15 campuses and more are expected to oppose. The third resolve recommends an extension to the timeline. There wasn’t time to exercise true and effective collaboration between the CO, the ASCSU, and the Council on Ethnic Studies. The fourth resolve is about autonomy for the campus. Fifth resolve is about the creation of Area F and the decrease units in Area D. The sixth resolve is about campus autonomy, giving more flexibility to students to meet ES requirements in lower and upper division. The sixth resolve is about the ASCSU and CO consulting with the Counsel on ES to arrive at the core competencies. The EC edited the resolution as recommendations were made during discussion. A. Hegde sent the draft to the members and asked that all changes be made by end of today in order to present to the Senate, November 12.

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

   c. **UPRC Changes (deferred)**

   d. **APM Proposal – GECCo (deferred)**

   e. **FYS Instructors and GECCo structure (deferred)**

   f. **EEGO course offerings – Summer Term (deferred)**

   g. **Post-Tenure Review Requirements (deferred)**

   h. **Handbook 306.2.2.e (deferred)**

   i. **Campus Data Needs (deferred)**
j. Syllabi Accessibility (deferred)
k. Alma Mater (deferred)
l. Faculty Poll regarding online instruction (deferred)
m. Sabbatical Application Procedures (deferred)

n. URC Recommendations (deferred)
o. Proposal for creation of a Department of Ethnic Studies (deferred)
p. Graduate student grievances and appeals – C. Lam presented the draft resolution for comments. The EC agreed it was ready for Senate.

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING NOVEMBER 12, 2020 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)**

   **Announcements**
   President Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10)

   **Approval of Agenda** (Time Certain 10:05)

   **Reports**

   **Resolutions**

   Consent Agenda

   New Business

   RES 202110 Academic Calendar Fall ’20 Spring ’21 Fall ’21 Spring ’22 Summer ’22
   RES 202111 Graduate Student Grievances and Appeals – Handbook Change
   RES 202112 CSUB Academic Senate Opposition to the Chancellor’s Office on the
   AB 1460 Implementation Plan

   Old Business

   RES 202109 Changes to the GE Breadth Requirement – Ethnic Studies

   **Open Forum and Wellness Check** (Time Certain 11:15)

   Past Senate Chair, V. Kohli (Time Certain 11:20) – A. Hegde said if she not available on
   the 12th, she will be invited to join the Senate’s extra meeting on the 19th.

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

   A. Hegde summarized action items for EC:

   1) Look through letter on Zoom recording and send thoughts to V. Harper
   2) Look at RES 202112 and make edits in track changes and then email to the EC.

   No meeting Nov 24th, the week of Thanksgiving.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

   A. Hegde adjourned the meeting at 11:33.
**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 08/25/20</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 16 Program Review Process Improvement</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td><strong>Addendum 8/25/20</strong> 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/19 11/03/20</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 18 Interdisciplinary BS Degree in Public Health Proposal 2020-2021 Referral 13 BS in Public Health</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td><strong>AAC</strong> 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 01 Master of Science in Computer Science</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td><strong>AAC</strong> 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 09 Expanded Winter Session</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td><strong>AAC</strong> 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 10 Course Repetition</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td><strong>AAC</strong> 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 11 Review of Ethnic Studies Unit Implementation Task Force Recommendations</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td><strong>AAC</strong> 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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 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>11/03/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 12 Proposal for a Master’s in Science in Accounting</td>
<td>AAC, BPC</td>
<td>The demand, structure, and resources required to deliver effectively and efficiently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Approved by Senate</td>
<td>Sent to President</td>
<td>Approved by President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 12 – Graduate Student Grievance and Appeals Policy – Reporting Chain</td>
<td>Carry-over Second Reading 11-19-20</td>
<td>AS&amp;SS Policy alignment: University Handbook, and Catalog The committee is waiting for the graduate policy. RES 202111 Graduate Student Grievances and Appeals – Handbook Change</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>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Affairs Committee: Mandy Rees/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>08/27/19</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>FAC Complete</td>
<td>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>FAC</td>
<td>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>FAC</td>
<td>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>AAC BPC</td>
<td>Program rationale, existing resources, additional resources required. RES 202108 Proposal for Master of Science in Computer Science</td>
<td>10-29-20</td>
<td>11-06-20</td>
<td>11-06-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 03 Institutional Research in Response to WSCUC Report</td>
<td>BPC</td>
<td>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>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>10/15/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 18 Interdisciplinary BS Degree in Public Health Proposal</td>
<td>AAC, BPC</td>
<td>The demand, structure, and resources required to deliver effectively and efficiently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11/03/20</strong></td>
<td><strong>2020-2021 Referral 13 BS in Public Health</strong></td>
<td><strong>AAC, BPC</strong></td>
<td>The demand, structure, and resources required to deliver effectively and efficiently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 12 Proposal for a Master’s in Science in Accounting</td>
<td>AAC, BPC</td>
<td>The demand, structure, and resources required to deliver effectively and efficiently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 into 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
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/
MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 14, 2020

TO: Dr. Aaron Hegde / Chair, Academic Senate
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 currentWSCUC 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.
Academic Program Review at CSUB: A Continuous Improvement Process

A Summary Report
Prepared by

Jinping Sun, Ph.D.
Professor, Public Policy & Administration
California State University, Bakersfield

August 22, 2020
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.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Suggested Changes to Program Review Documents
Appendix 2: UPRC Folders in Box and SharePoint
Appendix 3: Issues of Concern in Academic Program Review at CSUB
Appendix 4: Academic Program Review at CSUs – Information on the Website
Appendix 5: Program Review Best Practices – Interviews with other CSUs
Appendix 6: Proposed Recommendations for Improving Academic Program Review at CSUB
Appendix 7: Recommendations for Organizing Program Review Documents
Appendix 8: Proposed Survey of Program Directors/Department Chairs
Appendix 9: Proposed Survey of Deans/Associate Deans
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY AND PROCEDURES

California State University, Bakersfield
Spring 2010

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 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 Provost, and 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 Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost) as well as Associate Vice President for Academic Programs (AVPAP) within a reasonable time period for factual inaccuracies and evidence concerning the impact of these changes.

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 Provost, and 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 Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost) as well as Associate Vice President for Academic Programs (AVPAP) within a reasonable time period for factual inaccuracies and evidence concerning the impact of these changes.
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

30
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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Deleted: REVIEW FOR
Deleted: 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.
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.
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY AND PROCEDURES

California State University, Bakersfield
Fall 2020

As a university dedicated to meeting the needs of its region and to providing leadership and expertise for students and the community, California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) must actively plan for the future. A program review is an essential component of the active planning process. The 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.

REVISED BY THE UPRC October 13, 2020
APPROVED BY ACADEMIC SENATE
APPROVED BY PRESIDENT
# 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, impact, 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>Archives</td>
<td>a. Additional documents-2016-17&lt;br&gt;• UPRC Charge&lt;br&gt;• UPRC concerns: see Draft 2</td>
<td>Archives (No folder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Completed reviews&lt;br&gt;• Arts 2010-2011 Review&lt;br&gt;• Computer Science Review 2010-11&lt;br&gt;• PEAK&lt;br&gt;• PPA 2010-2011 Review&lt;br&gt;Information in this folder is duplicate, which is available in UPRC → Reviews by Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Correspondence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. External reviewer information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. General UPRC letterhead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. Memo’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h. MOUAP Archives&lt;br&gt;• MOUAP template&lt;br&gt;• Signed MOUAPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j. Program Review Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k. Program Review Templates 2016-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l. Program Reviews&lt;br&gt;• Program Reviews by year (2009-10 – 2017-18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate</td>
<td>files are also available in UPRC → Reviews by Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 15 Program Reviews folder – MSA Administration (online)</td>
<td>includes two different files from those in Reviews by Program _Administration 2015 16 [suggestion: Include two files in the Reviews by Program folder]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 17 Program Reviews folder – MA Educational Administration</td>
<td>suggestion: include a folder on MAEA in Reviews by Program folder under “Education MA”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 17 Program Reviews folder:</td>
<td>o also includes 2016-17 meeting agendas and minutes (9/28/2016 – 5/8/2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o also includes UPRC Workshop 2-10-17 (including agenda, PPT, eval forms)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Program scans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Thank you letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Trend analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. UPRC Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. UPRC Grid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. UPRC letterhead Contains same information as in General UPRC Letterhead folder (see f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. UPRC Previous committee members</td>
<td>contains same but less information as in UPRC Committee (see p)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. WASC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Welcome letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Welcome letters(1)</td>
<td>contains same but less information as in Welcome Letters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 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 18 files; signed MOUAPs Signed MOUAPs are in UPRC → Archives → MOUAP Archives                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 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                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Program Review                               | 2 files, same, one in Word, one in PDF No folder                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Template with Timeline</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Template with Timeline</td>
<td>2 files: MOUAP Template (2011-12 to 2016-17) + Program_Review_Template 2 (1/17/2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templates</td>
<td>No Folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews by Program</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration: Mixed up</td>
<td>No Folder: Individual program review listed separately in its own 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>Administration: No Folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folder of Administration in Completed Reviews folder. This is for the online MSA.</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: Archives/Supporting Documents Folders are empty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more documents</td>
<td></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>Program</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-BS-MS Geology</td>
<td>same PDF files + few more Word/Excel files; 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>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; No UPRC Final Letter 4/27/2020/External Reviewer Report March 2020, which are available in SharePoint.</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></td>
<td>Nursing (another folder in SharePoint called Nursing) Contains 1 PDF re program review notification (9/3/2019), which is same as the file in 2019-20 Due folder in BS_MS Nursing 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></td>
<td>BA-MPA PPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>same PDF files + few more Word files including UPRC Notification 1/15/2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-MPA in Public Administration (No folder)</td>
<td>but 1 file re UPRC Notification 1/15/2015 is included in BA-MPA PPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPA</td>
<td>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;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The other two Word files are in BA-MPA PPA Folder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Admin</td>
<td>Contains 2 folders:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archives folder includes more prior reviews info (1998-99; 2010-11; etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combine all folders into 1 folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Natural Sciences</td>
<td>same PDF files + more Word/Excel files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Physics</td>
<td>same + Physics 2015 Folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Physics 2015 Folder in Archives folder; Physics 2018-19 folder in Archives folder is empty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS-MS Biology</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Admin</td>
<td>Same + More old files (1997-98, 2009-10 review cycle materials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folder of Business Admin in Completed Reviews folder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Completed Reviews (No Separate Folder)
There is a “Completed Reviews” folder in Archives (see above in Archives section).

#### 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)
- In the folder of Reviews by Program – BS Computer Engineering
- In the folder of Reviews by Program – BS Electrical Engineering
- In the folder of Reviews by Program – BS Electrical Engineering
- In the folder of Reviews by Program – BS Engineering Sciences Supporting Documents folder

### 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

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

### Educational Counseling (No folder)
- Folder in Completed Reviews folder
- Contains 2 files: “EDCS Self study-Fall 15” & “EDCS-PR Memo 2”

### 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

### Criminal Justice (No folder)
- In Completed Reviews folder
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Details</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>Educational Administration</td>
<td>Contains 2010-11 Folder &amp; 1998-99 folder + other files Include a separate folder for MA Educational Administration Combine info from Box and SharePoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Year Experience</td>
<td>Contains 2013-14 folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Intelligence and National Security</td>
<td>Same + few more Word files No UPRC Memo (11/20/2015), which is available in SharePoint “GINS Final.”</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 No UPRF draft memo, which is available in SharePoint “INSTDraft1”</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>No review on Modern Languages &amp; Literature in SharePoint</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>Social Work</td>
<td>Social Work (NO folder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No folder</td>
<td>In Completed Reviews folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16 Social Work Folder is in BA Sociology folder in Archives Folder.</td>
<td>Has more files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combine the 2015-16 Social Work folder in BOX and Social Work folder in SharePoint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a separate folder in BOX with the above information included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Education</th>
<th>Special Education (NO folder)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 PDF file + Special Education 2016 folder</td>
<td>no Special Education 2016 folder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPED</th>
<th>SPED (NO folder)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>same 3 PDF files + 1 PDF file &quot;MOUAP SPECIAL ED 2016&quot;</td>
<td>In Completed Reviews folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED-Memo.2015: UPRC Memo (10/30/2015) not in Special Education folder, but in SPED folder in BOX and SharePoint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combine folders into 1 folder; include the above two files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Education</th>
<th>Teacher Education (NO folder)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But the following 2 are not in Box, which are available in SharePoint: &quot;S Schmidt MEMO dtd 11-16-16&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Stacey letter 11-15-16&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPRC Grid</th>
<th>UPRC Grid (NO folder)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Folder called “UPRC Grid 2019-2020”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Folders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2018-19: 10 files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2019-20: 2 files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPRC Meeting Agenda-Minutes</th>
<th>UPRC Meeting Agenda-Minutes (NO folder)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Folder called “Meeting Agenda-Minutes 2019-2020,” 114 files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minutes: 1/31/2019-3/10/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agenda: 2/7/2019-3/3/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPRC Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 files</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members and Term Limits</th>
<th>4 files; 2016-2017 UPRC membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Folder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRC Letterhead</td>
<td>Folder called “UPRC Official-LH-6-4-19,” 1 Word File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRC Review Cycle 2019</td>
<td>2 files + 1 Outlook Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRC Workshops</td>
<td>• UPRC Workshop 2017: 20 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• UPRC Workshop 2018: 21 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• UPRC Workshop Fall 2019: 10 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• UPRC Workshop Spring 2019: 1 item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Thumbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important Communications</td>
<td>NO folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>• Two files: .DS Store and Thumbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Folder empty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other files:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• English letter revised_updated_02_12_2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• O365 Groups – QRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preparing a winning self-study1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Program review roster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• UPRC Workshops Feb 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>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>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

Dominquez 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  
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/1IF7nNAybb3LzAnGFm0myCg?htGaPY/view  
6. CAPR Committee Policies & Procedures (CAPR Charge):  
   https://docs.google.com/document/d/16t5vMmW98kib8g0askhM4m_QLc9CUMLi_PTLXND-DeU/edit  

Fresno  
1. University Committee Review: https://www.fresnostate.edu/academics/curriculum/prop-review/  
   Undergraduate Curriculum Committee:  
   http://www.fresnostate.edu/academics/senate/committees/curriculum/index.html  
   University Graduate Committee:  
   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
   a. Policy on program review
   b. Program review schedule (by college/program)
   c. Program review subcommittee (current members)
   d. 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
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

San Jose
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

San Luis Obispo
1. 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_APR_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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Dr. Bernadette Muscat: Undergraduate Program Review Officer; Interim Dean,</td>
<td>7/9/2020 9am-10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate Studies Office Dr. James Marshall: Graduate Program Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officer; Dean, Division of Research and Graduate Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>Dr. Sharlene Sayegh: Director of Program Review and Assessment; Accreditation</td>
<td>7/9/2020 10am-11am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liaison Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Dr. Karin Elliott Brown: Associate Vice President and Dean of Graduate</td>
<td>7/13/2020 3pm-4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies; Accreditation Liaison Officer</td>
<td></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</td>
<td>7/8/2020 2pm-3pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Success and Community Partnerships Specialist; assessment guru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Interview Questions: Targeted Questions

1. East Bay:
   a. CAPR Charge:
      https://docs.google.com/document/d/16t5vMmW98jyb8g0askhM4m_QLe9CUMIj_PTLXND-DeU/edit
   b. Academic Program Review Procedures:
      https://drive.google.com/file/d/1IF7nNAybb3LzAnGFnn0myCg7htGt2PYI/view

2. Fresno
   a. Data in undergraduate/graduate Program Review:

3. Long Beach
   a. Comprehensive
   b. Academic Senate Policy on Program Review:

4. Los Angeles
   a. Program Review Self-study Handbook:
      http://www.calstatela.edu/sites/default/files/groups/WSCUC%20Accreditation%2C%20Program%20Review%2C%20and%20Assessment/Exhibits/6.7_-_program_review_handbook.pdf

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></td>
<td>Notify programs one year in advance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Require programs to submit a Program Review Progress Report</td>
<td></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></td>
<td>Develop and approve annual report template</td>
<td>Faculty, Deans, Administration</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></td>
<td>Require deans to participate in MOUAPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Require dean to be involved in annual reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Study and Program Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td>Hold program review orientations/workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select and post sample program reviews online</td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Programs</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 that include both undergraduate and graduate programs</td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Review</strong></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></td>
<td>Coordinate and plan external review visit two months in advance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post External Review</strong></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></td>
<td>Post MOUAPs online</td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentation and Reporting of Program Reviews</strong></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!
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,

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

---

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

Policy on course syllabi: http://www.csub.edu/facultyAffairs/files/handbook/UniversityHandbook.pdf pg. 32

School curriculum committee:
A&H    http://www.csub.edu/ah/Curriculum_Committee/
SSE     http://www.csub.edu/sse/documents/SSE%20Handbook%202012.pdf (pg. 19)
NSM&E   http://www.csub.edu/nsme/curriculum.shtml

Approval of New Course:
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.
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
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
Aaron,

Another exciting issue for the Senate to consider: Although laws require materials in all courses to be accessible, we have no mechanism to assure that syllabi properly address accessibility. It looks like we need school curriculum committees to review syllabi for all courses to assure that they address accessibility. I know that's a workload issue, but failing an audit of this kind of thing could be a bigger workload issue, so I hope the Senate will take this on.

In the discussion about this issue, the possibility was considered that syllabi approved by the curriculum committees can go out of date, so we may need a policy requiring periodic review of all syllabi, maybe setting up a rotation of departments with a set being reviewed each year on a five-year cycle.

Thanks,
Bruce

Bruce D. Hartsell, LCSW
Interim Associate Vice-president for Faculty Affairs
California State University Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, CA 93311
661 654-2154
In the academic year 2019-2020, the University Review Committee (URC) reviewed 36 files in the Fall cycle and 45 files in the Spring cycle. At the conclusion of the two review cycles, the URC convened to discuss issues that arose in this year's review process and identified the following issues.

1. There was a large number of requests for early tenure and promotion. Altogether, there is one (1) request in the Fall cycle (tenure-track, second year) and nine (9) in the Spring cycle (everyone else). According to University Handbook 305.3.4.b, “Early tenure and/or promotion of probationary faculty should be a rare event,” and 305.3.4.c, “Early promotion for tenured faculty is granted for exceptional performance and should be a rare event.” While there are guidelines for early tenure, according to Faculty Handbook 305.2.4.a, “Faculty have compiled a record of exceptional performance in teaching (for counselors, exceptional performance in counseling) and scholarly/creative activities and of acceptable performance in professionally related service at California State University, Bakersfield,” the URC notes that for certain departments,
   a. The “exceptional performance” criteria are not specific enough; or
   b. The “exceptional performance” criteria are too easily achieved; or
   c. The “exceptional performance” criteria do not exist.

   The committee also noted that evaluation criteria vary greatly between departments, even within the same school.

2. Even though the amount of paperwork required is restricted to a three-inch binder, it is still a hassle for the URC to have to visit a specific room on campus to review the files, let alone taking up a room for 10 weeks each year just for this particular purpose.

3. With the increased number of faculty hires in recent years, the number of files to be reviewed is increasing. It is becoming increasingly difficult for URC members to thoroughly review all files.

With the above observations, the URC recommends

1. Certain departments revisit their “exceptional criteria” to make early tenure requests a rarer event. The criteria should also be specific enough for committees and individuals not in the field to carry out evaluation.

2. In the case of early tenure requests, the candidate’s scholarship performance should be evaluated by an external reviewer outside of the university. Their teaching performance evaluated either by a faculty outside of the School, or by the Faculty Teaching & Learning Center.

3. At the School level, unit criteria between departments should be made more uniform as much as possible.

4. The University should consider submission of RTP files to a secured cloud platform, eliminating the need for paper files.
5. Instead of mandatory reviews at years 2, 3, 5, 6, where year 4 is optional, the URC suggests reviews at years 2, 4, and 6, with year 5 being optional.
DATE: October 13, 2020

TO: Dr. Debra Jackson / Interim Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Academic Programs

CC: Dr. Jorge Moraga/ Assistant Professor, Interdisciplinary Studies
    Dr. Tracey Salisbury/ Assistant Professor, Interdisciplinary Studies

FROM: Dr. Alicia Rodriquez / Director, Interdisciplinary Studies Program

RE: Proposal to Create an Ethnic Studies Department

Please find attached a proposal to create a Department of Ethnic Studies at CSUB. This proposal was developed and approved by the Interdisciplinary Studies faculty, Dr. Jorge Moraga, Dr. Tracey Salisbury, and me. Among those who were consulted in the process were Dr. Arno Argueta, Assistant Professor, Department of Modern Languages and Literatures; Ms. Sandra Bozarth, Associate Librarian, Walter W. Stiern Library; Dr. Ivy Cargile, Assistant Professor of Political Science; Dr. Rhonda Dugan, Associate Professor of Sociology; Dr. Kiran Garcha, Assistant Professor of History; Dr. Bill Kelley, Jr., Assistant Professor, Department of Art and Art History; Dr. David Sandles, Lecturer in Teacher Education; and Dr. Adam Sawyer, Assistant Professor of Teacher Education.

In addition, the following Department Chairs and Program Directors were consulted regarding courses that could potentially serve as Ethnic Studies cognate courses: Dr. Reem Abu-Lughod, Criminal Justice; Dr. Janet Armentor-Cota, Sociology; Dr. Steven Frye, English; Dr. Steve Gamboa, Philosophy and Religious Studies; Ms. Kris Grappendorf, Kinesiology; Dr. Joel Haney, Music and Theatre; Dr. Dustin Knepp, Modern Languages and Literatures; Dr. Mark Martinez, Political Science; Mr. Patrick O’Neil, Anthropology; Dr. Adam Sawyer, Liberal Studies; Mr. Jesse Sugarmann, Art and Art History; and Dr. Miriam Vivian, History.
1. Ethnic Studies Department Proposal for CSUB

a. How and why elevating the Ethnic Studies concentration in Interdisciplinary Studies to an Ethnic Studies Department and degree program will better serve institutional needs:

Elevating the Ethnic Studies concentration in Interdisciplinary Studies into an Ethnic Studies Department paves the way for an Ethnic Studies degree program, as anticipated by the CSU Academic Master Plan (AMP). Not only does the current national discussion on race relations, inequality, and discrimination among racialized groups make the moment right for the creation of an Ethnic Studies Department, but also new mandates from the California State University and the California State Legislature make the creation of an Ethnic Studies Department imperative.

The California State Legislature’s passage of AB 1460 and Governor Gavin Newsom signing the bill into law requires that students must take a 3-unit course in ethnic studies. In this legislation, ethnic studies is defined as “an interdisciplinary and comparative study of race and ethnicity with special focus on four historically defined racialized core groups: Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latina and Latino Americans.” The policy will go into effect in Fall 2021.

Concurrently, the California State University revised its Title 5 General Education Breadth Requirements to include as part of General Education a minimum of three semester units of “lower-division study designed to understand ethnic studies.”

These new policies together mean that there will be an urgent need to offer an adequate number of sections of approved Ethnic Studies courses to meet student demand, which will allow our students to graduate in a timely manner and help CSUB meet its graduation targets. At CSUB, this translates into a need for as many as 34 sections of introductory required Ethnic Studies courses each year. Though courses that address or engage race and ethnicity have long been offered in disciplines such as Sociology, History, and Anthropology, understanding the unique genesis of the discipline of Ethnic Studies helps explain why the new mandates must be met by – and are required to be met by – courses offered in that specific discipline.

In 1969, the San Francisco campus of the California State University became the birthplace of the academic discipline of Ethnic Studies. The discipline, which recently celebrated fifty years since its establishment, has grown into a robust, complex and diverse area of study that seeks to provide a wholistic and thorough examination of the histories and experiences of the traditionally underrepresented, racialized groups in the United States: Native Americans, African Americans, Chicano/a/x/Latina/o/x Americans, and Asian American/Pacific Islanders. In the context of exploring the experiences of these groups, the discipline seeks to provide a critical examination and analysis of racism and white supremacy in this country. Furthermore, as a discipline born from activism, it seeks to help students understand and promote participatory democracy, community responsiveness, and social justice.
The global pandemic and the murder of George Floyd have given rise to the current national conversation on race and ethnic relations and have highlighted systemic inequality and discrimination across the educational, employment, judicial, health care, and economic systems in the United States. To members of the groups that have experienced discrimination, the current climate has produced a new, vibrant, and perhaps unparalleled fiery wave of social justice activism. In addition, many White Americans are awakening to the depths of these inequities and likewise calling for change. Now is the time for CSUB to do its part in addressing the problems that racialized Americans face by not only offering Ethnic Studies courses, but by establishing an Ethnic Studies Department.

An Ethnic Studies Department will serve as a place to educate students and as a center for frank discussions that will promote positive social change in our region. Exposure to the discipline’s teachings and explorations of systemic racism and discrimination, as well as its emphasis on activism, will help shine the harsh light of reality on the shortcomings and problems not only affecting the nation, but on those affecting our community. Furthermore, the CSU AMP includes a planned program for an Ethnic Studies Bachelor of Arts degree. An established Ethnic Studies Department, combined with the courses it will offer to serve the new Ethnic Studies requirement, will facilitate the full degree program’s development by having firmly built a foundation of key lower-division program components for the full BA.

The opportunity to take Ethnic Studies courses that fulfill General Education requirements will serve all students – regardless of race or ethnicity – in the modern, diverse workplace and world in which they live, and exposure to the GE courses will serve as a conduit to the BA program anticipated by the AMP. The awareness of the complex histories and experiences of these racialized groups – and of the lingering legacy of white supremacy in our community, and how it may insidiously manifest itself in everyday life – provides students with the opportunity to better serve and work with those with whom they might not share cultural experiences.

Finally, it should be noted that CSUB has long been laying the foundation for the establishment of an Ethnic Studies Department. In 2014, Chancellor Timothy White formed a statewide CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies. While serving as President of CSUB, Dr. Horace Mitchell chaired the task force, which released its recommendation in January 2016, calling for the expansion of Ethnic Studies at the CSU. That document led to the hiring, in 2017, of two new faculty members trained in Ethnic Studies, Dr. Jorge Moraga and Dr. Tracey Salisbury. The intention was that they would provide the seeds from which a new program would grow. The progress sputtered, however, resulting in a disservice to CSUB’s students, and disappointment and frustration on the part of the new faculty.

An effort that paralleled President Mitchell’s Ethnic Studies Task Force chairmanship was the planning, application, awarding, and implementation of a National Endowment for the Humanities Grant, "Crossing Borders, Making Connections: Interdisciplinarity,
Humanities, and Ethnic Studies,” under the co-direction on Dr. Dustin Knepp, Associate Professor of Modern Languages and Literature and then Director of Interdisciplinary Studies, and Dr. Liora Gubkin-Malicdem, Associate Dean of Arts and Humanities and Professor of Religious Studies at CSUB. The grant funded an on-campus discussion group that explored the discipline of Ethnic Studies, engaged in community outreach efforts, and worked to create an awareness among the CSUB campus community and its service region of the purpose and need for the anticipated Ethnic Studies Department.

Given the new CSU and State of California Ethnic Studies mandates, CSUB’s central role in promoting the expansion of Ethnic Studies, as represented by President Horace Mitchell’s service on the Ethnic Studies Task Force, and the stage set by the “Crossing Borders,” grant, now is the time for CSUB to act in earnest and honor its commitment to our students, the faculty who will teach the new Ethnic Studies courses, and the community that the university serves. The folly of hiring faculty without providing them with a designated home academic department has been an injustice to those faculty and will be so to new faculty hired to meet the Ethnic Studies requirement. Offering Ethnic Studies courses without supporting a broader discipline-specific program with a department would undermine the sincerity of university’s commitment to Ethnic Studies and would reduce the requirement to mere tokenism.

b. How the change will affect the governance and delivery of curriculum and degree programs:

The Interdisciplinary Studies faculty who are expected to migrate to an Ethnic Studies Department expect that the new home for the department and the degree program will be in the School of Social Sciences and Education (SSE). Currently, Interdisciplinary Studies, in which the Ethnic Studies concentration lay, is housed in Academic Programs. Interdisciplinary Studies will remain in Academic Programs and after any student who is pursuing the Ethnic Studies concentration completes the program under the teach out policy, the concentration will be dissolved.

c. How will the change affect recruitment, appointment, review, promotion and tenure of faculty, as well as faculty assignments and workload:

The founding faculty of the Ethnic Studies Department and degree program anticipated by the AMP will have the option of staying in the Interdisciplinary Studies Program, where they will continue to undergo review using the Modern Languages and Literatures RTP criteria under which they were hired, or they can choose to move to the new Ethnic Studies program where they will be considered Ethnic Studies faculty and undergo future reviews using the new Ethnic Studies RTP criteria, beginning when they move to the new Ethnic Studies Department. Once the faculty member chooses to move to Ethnic Studies Department and accepts that they will undergo all future reviews under the new Ethnic Studies RTP criteria, beginning when they move to the new Ethnic Studies Department, the decision is final and irrevocable.
In addition to the existing INST faculty who are expected to migrate to the new Department of Ethnic Studies, additional faculty, at the minimum rank of lecturer, must be hired to meet the demand created by the new Ethnic Studies requirement. An insufficient number of qualified faculty will mean an inadequate number of sections offered, resulting in bottlenecks that will hinder students’ academic progress and negatively affect graduation rates.

Assuming a 4% increase each fall semester in first-time freshmen, the projected enrollments will be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
<th>Fall 2020</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
<th>Fall 2022</th>
<th>Fall 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total FTF</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>1,529</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>1,653</td>
<td>1,719</td>
<td>1,787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The projected increase in first-time freshmen enrollments translates into the need for as many as 34 sections of approved Ethnic Studies courses to be offered annually. Therefore, this expected demand anticipates the need to hire two full-time lecturers beginning in Fall 2020, and an additional lecturer in Fall 2021. The need for yet another full-time lecturer is expected in the program’s five year of operation, AY 2025-2026.

With regard to workload, it is expected that the department chair would receive six (6) WTUs of reassigned time each semester, for a total of twelve (12) WTUs of reassigned time each academic year. Aside from the reassigned time for the department chair, faculty workload and assignments will conform to the contract in effect between the California Faculty Association and the California State University.

d. How the change will affect the need for financial support, including operating expenses, equipment, facilities, and workload:

It is anticipated that the two Interdisciplinary Studies tenure-track faculty, Dr. Jorge Moraga and Dr. Tracey Salisbury, will leave that program and become the inaugural faculty of the new Ethnic Studies Program for which both faculty will develop new courses as part of the Ethnic Studies general major and for concentrations in Black Studies and Latina/o/x Studies. The departments/programs that are able to offer courses that may support Ethnic Studies by serving as cognate courses include the following: Anthropology, Art and Art History, Criminal Justice, English, History, Kinesiology, Music, Political Science, Religious Studies, Liberal Studies, and Theatre.

With the exception of support for library materials identified below, because the faculty who will comprise the faculty are currently supported through existing programs, the greatest expense that will be incurred will be in the need for support staff. Support staff in Academic Programs currently serve the Interdisciplinary Studies Program, but as the Ethnic Studies Program will be housed in an academic school, it will need a new Administrative Support Coordinator within the school.
Lastly, as noted above, with the implementation of AB 1460 by Fall 2021, our campus will need to offer at least 15 sections each semester of introductory courses that satisfy the Ethnic Studies requirement. Therefore, the need to hire full-time faculty trained in Ethnic Studies (or related fields) will remain of vital importance. Despite the grim budget realities anticipated over the next three years as a result of the global pandemic, it will remain vital that institutional support for this new unit be a priority. It would be a disservice to the CSUB community if the university advances an Ethnic Studies Department only to have its Ethnic Studies faculty be limited to teaching introductory courses that satisfy AB 1460, thus crippling program’s ability to develop and implement the anticipated full BA curriculum and programmatic offerings.

e. What impact will the plan have on Information Resources (library books and subscriptions, computing equipment and support) and what is the source for additional funding:

Associate CSUB Librarian, Sandra Bozarth, has indicated that while the full-time faculty who teach in Interdisciplinary Studies (and who are expected to teach in the Ethnic Studies Program), have not requested additions to the existing databases or new journal subscriptions, the costs could change if new courses are added that will require additional support. Below are the costs that could be incurred should the existing faculty request additional support once the program is approved. It is worth noting that the faculty who are expected to teach in Ethnic Studies are current CSUB faculty whose current needs are supported with existing resources, and that costs for current existing courses can fluctuate each semester, depending on the media needed to support a course. The below represents an estimate of the possible costs that would be involved, should the faculty need new materials.

JOURNALS:
1. Title-by-title subscriptions will cost about $3000-$10000 per year OR
2. additional journal databases between $2000 and $8000 per year per

BOOKS & MONOGRAPHS:
$3000 – $4000 to purchase subject specific books (print and/or electronic; electronic are more expensive but allow greater access to students) related to the specific courses that are going to be offered.

MEDIA:
3-year subscriptions to videos with the possibility of maybe purchasing some in perpetuity. This can get up to $6000 per class for perpetual (prices tend to be between $375 and $1200 perpetual) or $150 per video per year on either a 1 or 3 year license. This would be where a significant amount of money would be spent in the first 2-3 years of the program.

Minimum suggested startup costs: $5000 - $15000
Sandra Bozarth writes, “If this funding is not available at the start of the academic year, the department could likely be sustained with current materials but faculty requests for new materials may not be approved and will be combined with other library materials requests as is normal practice.”

In addition, Bozarth indicated that the program should plan on an annual increase in costs of approximately 5-7 percent each year. Please see the accompanying Five-Year Budget Projection for an estimation of costs.

In terms of overall costs, as the Five-Year Budget Projection indicates, the new program represents a significant investment by CSUB, the CSU, and the people of the State of California. Indeed, if the CSU is to live up to its moniker, “The People’s University,” CSUB will do well to support a program that is truly inclusive of all the people of California.

**f. Plan for effecting the change:**
The faculty would work closely with the Dean of the school in which the program would be housed, the Office of the Provost, Academic Programs, Academic Operations and Support, as well as faculty groups, including the Academic Senate, the General Education Curriculum Committee, and the Curriculum Committee of the School in which Ethnic Studies will be housed to ensure a smooth program start up.

October 13, 2020
THE FORMATION AND MODIFICATION OF ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS: PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES

PRINCIPLES:

1. Requests to change the structure of a department should usually emerge from the concerns of the faculty and/or the dean directly involved. However, other individuals of the university may suggest that the faculty examine the effectiveness of the present departmental structure.

2. A new department may be formed as an entirely new entity, as a result of dividing an existing department, or as a result of combining two or more existing departments.

3. If the change affects more than one school, then more than one dean will be involved, so any references to a dean in this policy statement imply more than one dean if the situation so indicates.

4. Collegiality is the fundamental principle upon which the governance of the university rests. At any point in this process, any of the parties involved may consult informally with anyone in the campus community whose contribution seems desirable.

PROCEDURES

1. If someone suggests a change in departmental structure, the relevant faculty, the appropriate academic dean and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs should engage in considerable informal discussion. These people should solicit advice from other potentially interested parties, possibly including faculty in other departments or schools as well as the Academic Senate.

2. When informal discussions appear to have elicited all of the relevant issues and concerns, the faculty who wish to form the new department should write a proposal that addresses the following points:

(a) How and why the change will better serve institutional needs;

(b) How the change will affect the governance and delivery of curriculum and degree programs;

(c) How the change will affect recruitment, appointment, review, promotion and tenure of faculty, as well as faculty assignments and workload;

(d) How the change will affect the need for financial support, including operating expenses, equipment, facilities and staffing;

(e) What impact the plan will have on Information Resources (Library books and subscriptions, computing equipment and support) and what is the source for additional funding; and

(f) A plan for effecting the change.

3. The proposal must pass through the following levels of review in the order indicated. The individual(s) at each level shall review the proposal, consult with others as seems appropriate, and then either forward it to the next level with a positive recommendation or return it to the previous level with a written explanation of the reasons for withholding approval:

(a) The appropriate academic dean, who shall inform any potentially interested faculty and invite their consultation;

(b) The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who shall inform the Council of Deans and invite their consultation;
(c) The Academic Senate, through the Executive Committee, shall forward this proposal to Standing Committees or to the Full Senate at its reasoned discretion before taking final action; and

(d) The President, who shall inform the Cabinet and invite their consultation before delivering his/her final decision regarding the proposal.

4. If the proposal fails to receive approval at any level, those involved may choose to revise and resubmit it.

APPROVED BY ACADEMIC SENATE APRIL 10, 1997
APPROVED BY PRESIDENT ARCINIEGA MAY 5, 1997
TITLE MODIFIED BY THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE 2012
PROCEDURES MODIFIED AND APPROVED BY ACADEMIC SENATE OCTOBER 24, 2013
APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT ON NOVEMBER 14, 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHS Department Five-Year Budget Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yearly Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel - Salary and Benefits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Reassignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Equipment**                             |
| Desk and chair                            | 6,000.00  | 2,000.00  | 0.00      | 0.00      | 2,000.00  |
| Computer                                  | 3,870.00  | 1,290.00  | 0.00      | 0.00      | 1,290.00  |
| Printer (ASC)                             | 700.00    |           |           |           |           |

| **Supplies**                              |
| Office Supplies                           | 5,966.00  | 5,966.00  | 5,966.00  | 5,966.00  | 5,966.00  |
| Library Resources                         | 10,000.00 | 10,500.00 | 11,025.00 | 11,576.00 | 12,154.00 |

| **Yearly Total**                          |
| 332,452.00                                | 411,756.00| 408,991.00| 433,458.00| 547,326.00|
## ACADEMIC PLAN

### Existing and Projected Degree Programs 2020-21 through 2029-30

California State University, Bakersfield

### Note:

- Underlined programs are nationally accredited subject areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School or Division and Degree Program Title</th>
<th>Existing Degree Type</th>
<th>Projected Program and Originally Approved Implementation Year</th>
<th>Academic Year for Scheduled Program Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Arts and Humanities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2022-23</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>BA^@</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2019-22-2023</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>BA MA</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2022-23</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>BA MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina/o and Latin American Studies</td>
<td>BA 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2019-2026-20-27</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2021-22</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2019-2026-2027</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>BA MA</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2019-2025-2026</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2022-23</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Business and Public Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2022-23</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Business (pilot-2014)</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2024-2025-2026</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Economics and Analytics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2024-2025-2026</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>BS MBA</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2021-22</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2019-2026-2027</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Resource Management</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2019-2026-2027</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2020-2025-2126</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Administration</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2020-2025-2126</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Suspended program
^ Offered only through self-support
^@ Offered through both state-support and self-support
@ Online program

**Formatted:** Underline
# ACADEMIC PLAN

Existing and Projected Degree Programs
2020-21 through 2029-30
California State University, Bakersfield
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School or Division and Degree Program Title</th>
<th>Existing Degree Type</th>
<th>Projected Program and Originally Approved Implementation Year</th>
<th>Academic Year for Scheduled Program Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logistics and Supply Chain Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>MS 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>BA, MPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MS 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School of Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School or Division and Degree Program Title</th>
<th>Existing Degree Type</th>
<th>Projected Program and Originally Approved Implementation Year</th>
<th>Academic Year for Scheduled Program Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>BS, MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>2024-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>MS 2017</td>
<td>2022-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2024-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Sciences</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2024-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>BS 2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>BA, BS, MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Biological Sciences</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>BS, MAT*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>BA*, BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2023-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>BS, MS</td>
<td>DNP 2024</td>
<td>2022-2024-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2018-2025-2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>BS 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Suspended program
^ Offered only through self-support
^^ Offered through both state-support and self-support
^^^ Pilot Program
@ Online program

Note: Underlined programs are nationally accredited subject areas
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Existing and Projected Degree Programs
2020-21 through 2029-30
California State University, Bakersfield
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School or Division and Degree Program Title</th>
<th>Existing Degree Type</th>
<th>Projected Program and Originally Approved Implementation Year</th>
<th>Academic Year for Scheduled Program Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Bachelor’s BA</td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Neuroscience</td>
<td>Master’s MA</td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>2025-2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Adolescent and Family Studies</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2021-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2019-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2021-2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>MA^</td>
<td></td>
<td>2021-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2021-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2022-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>MS 2020</td>
<td>2023-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2019-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2019-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>MSW^</td>
<td></td>
<td>2021-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>BA^^</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary and Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>MS^@</td>
<td></td>
<td>2021-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2023-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>BA, BS</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>2021-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Suspended program
^ Offered only through self-support
^^ Offered through both state-support and self-support
^^^ Pilot Program
@ Online program
Note: Underlined programs are nationally accredited subject areas
ACADEMIC PLAN
Existing and Projected Degree Programs
2020-21 through 2029-30
California State University, Bakersfield

* Suspended program
^ Offered only through self-support
^^ Offered through both state-support and self-support
@ Online program
Note: Underlined programs are nationally accredited subject areas
Title of Proposed Program | Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)/Nurse Practitioner (NP) Program
---|---
Degree Designation (e.g., BS) | Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) Degree
Projected Implementation Date | Fall 2023
College | NSME
Department | Nursing
Contact Name(s) and Email(s) | Heidi He hhe@csub.edu

1. ***Delivery mode of program:**
   - [ ] Fully Face-to-Face
   - [x] Hybrid
   - [ ] Fully Online

   The DNP program will use a hybrid curriculum which provides students the flexibility of online learning and the personal interaction with faculty and their peers in a traditional face-to-face format. FNP clinical courses are offered fully face-to-face allowing maximum faculty contacts and support. FNP didactic courses will be offered in a hybrid format (combination of face-to-face and online). Core DNP courses, such as health care policy and leadership, will be provided in a fully online format.

2. ***Support Mode:**
   - [x] State-Support
   - [ ] Self-Support/Extended Education

   We feel strongly that the DNP/NP program should be offered through state support. As the only NP program in a 100-mile radius, our NP program provides career paths for educationally and economically disadvantaged students from the Southern San Joaquin Valley. We are committed to providing affordable and excellent NP education.

3. **A brief summary of the purpose and characteristics of the proposed degree program:**

   The purpose of the proposed Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)/Nurse Practitioner (NP) Degree is to comply with the emerging national NP education requirement. In May 2018, the National Organization of Nurse Practitioner Faculties (NONPF), the national leader in nurse practitioner education, made the commitment to require a DNP degree for all entry level nurse practitioner (NP) education by 2025 (Appendix A). NONPF further asserted that DNP curriculum should be seamless, without a master’s degree exit point as preparation for entry into the NP role. With this initiative, NP education will transition from master’s level education to DNP level education nationally by 2025. Unless CSU Bakersfield transitions its NP to a DNP degree, our MSN/NP graduates may not be qualified to take national certification examinations and may be unable to compete with other DNP prepared graduates in the professional job market.

   Nurse Practitioners are Advanced Practice Registered Nurses who have additional education and training and have expanded scope of practice over the traditional RN role. They make diagnosis, initiate and manage treatment plans, including prescribing medications and medical devices. The NP profession has grown to fill an import and vital role helping to reduce the chronic shortage of primary care providers in the US. The increasingly complex healthcare environment demands the highest level of scientific knowledge and practice expertise to assure quality patient outcomes.

   Currently, the DON at CSUB offers a Master of Science in Nursing, Family Nurse Practitioner (MSN/FNP) program, which is designed to prepare Family Nurse Practitioners. Transitioning our existing MSN/FNP to a
DNP program becomes a necessity. A DNP/NP program will meet the emerging national standard that all entry level nurse practitioners are DNP prepared, and will allow us to continue our efforts in preparing well qualified health care providers to meet the local health care workforce demand for our chronically medically underserved community in the California Central Valley.

In May 2018, the California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees adopted changes to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulation allowing CSU to award the Doctor of Nursing Practice degree independently of any other higher education institutions (Appendix B). Currently, there are several DNP degree programs in the CSU System.

4. **List the program learning objectives:**
   The objectives of the DNP program are to prepare graduates to:
   - Assess, analyze, evaluate, and manage complex health environments serving diverse populations to improve patient and population health outcomes;
   - Apply clinical scholarship and available evidence to make clinical and system decisions incorporating professional values and ethical principles;
   - Support and improve patient care and health care systems through the use of clinical practice models, health policy, informatics, and organizational leadership skills;
   - Advocate for clinical prevention, population health initiatives, and evidence-based health policy through interprofessional and stakeholder collaboration.

5. **Suggested CIP code:**
   - CSU Degree Program Code: 12033
   - Paired CIP Code: 51.3818

6. **For new degree programs that are not already offered in the CSU, provide a compelling rationale**
   explaining how the proposed subject areas constitutes a coherent, integrated degree program that has potential value to students and that meets CSU requirements for an academic program at the undergraduate or graduate level

7. **The program’s fit with the campus mission and strategic plan:**
   The DNP/NP program will strongly support every aspect of the University Mission: “CSU Bakersfield is a comprehensive public university offering excellent undergraduate and graduate programs that advance the intellectual and personal development of its students. We emphasize student learning through our commitment to scholarship, ethical behavior, diversity, service, global awareness and life-long learning. The University collaborates with partners in the community to increase the region’s overall educational attainment, enhance its quality of life, and support its economic development.”

   The DNP doctoral education will advance our students’ intellectual and personal development. These doctorally prepared NPs will acquire knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values essential to the practice of professional nursing. They will make autonomous and collaborative judgments in a variety of healthcare situations and will be accountable for their practice.
Second, as independent clinicians, Nurse Practitioners must commit to lifelong learning to stay current with new research findings and emerging best practices and help patients and their families navigate the complex and ever-changing health care landscape. The doctoral education will provide Nurse Practitioners the breadth and depth of knowledge to provide patient centered, culturally competent quality health care, and further contribute to improving health outcomes in the community.

Furthermore, the DNP/NP program addresses several of the social determinants of health such as poverty, low education rates, and access to healthcare, for California’s Central Valley population by preparing a locally trained, highly qualified health care workforce. These doctorally prepared Nurse Practitioners will increase the number of health care professionals in the chronically medically underserved California Central Valley, thereby increasing access to health care and providing culturally competent care. These Nurse Practitioners will also serve as role models for local residents, especially children, who live in a community where educational attainment is low and poverty rates are high.

8. **Anticipated student demand:** Provide projections in the table below and identify the evidence you have used to make these projections (e.g., US Bureau of Labor Statistics).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At Initiation</th>
<th>After 3 Years</th>
<th>After 5 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Majors (Annual)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Graduates (Cumulative)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence:
Currently, the DON at CSUB offers a Master of Science in Nursing, Family Nurse Practitioner (MSN/FNP) program. Since its reopening in 2014, the FNP program has consistently had more qualified applicants than available seats even without advertising or recruitment, averaging 50 qualified applicants for 18 seats each year. We anticipate the demand for the DNP/NP program will mirror current demand, with proper outreach and recruitment, since MSN/NP program will no longer be an option nationwide in the near future. We plan to accept a cohort of 18 students every year.

9. **Workforce demands and employment opportunities for graduates:** Describe the demands and opportunities, as well as the evidence you have used to make these claims.

Many areas in Kern County have been designated as Rural or Health Professional Shortage Areas by Health Resources and Service Administration (HRSA, 2018). The latest data shows that the Primary Care Provider to Patient Ratio is 1:2,037 in Kern County, while California average is 1:1260 (Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, 2020).

Since 2016, the FNP program at CSUB has graduated three cohorts, a total of 50 FNPs, demonstrating its value in providing locally trained well qualified health care providers to the region. The majority of our graduates are working in local medically underserved communities providing much needed care to underserved population. These locally trained NP graduates are highly sought after by the local health care agencies. Many of them received multiple offers with generous compensation package even before their graduation.

10. **Other relevant societal needs:**
Many areas in Kern county and California’s Central Valley are designated as Health Professional Shortage Areas (HPSA) and Medically Underserved Areas (MUA) by the US Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) (2018). Kern County residents have poorer health outcomes compared to residents of other counties in California. Of the 57 ranked counties, Kern placed 52nd in terms of overall health outcomes (California Department of Public Health, 2018; Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, 2018). In addition, the projected national shortage of primary care physicians (HRSA, 2013), the expanding older population, the entry of the previously uninsured into the mainstream health system, and the characteristics of the rapidly growing community are expected to add further strains on an already overburdened health system in Kern County.

Recruitment and retention of qualified primary care providers has been a challenge for the Central Valley’s rural and underserved areas. Research has found that having an existing connection to the community, and growing up in a medically underserved setting, is associated with the intent to practice in underserved areas. CSUB NP program is the logical solution to meet community demand. It will increase the recruitment and retention of primary care providers in the region, without the costly need to recruit and relocate providers who have no ties to the community. Most of our NP students are local residents with strong local ties. Their unique understanding of the community makes them culturally competent, empathetic and effective health care providers. More important, they desire to stay in the community to serve their community. Transitioning to the DNP program will only further CSUB’s contribution to the community by providing vital educational resources and health care services to address the shortage of primary care providers in our community and is a critical asset for California’s Central Valley.

11. An assessment of the required resources and the campus commitment to allocating those resources:
Provide a narrative description of resources that will be needed at initiation, after three years, and after five years. Note: Approval of this proposal by campus entities represents the campus commitment to allocating these resources.

Currently the MSN/FNP program is a 2-year 5- semester program. The proposed DNP program will be a 3-year 8- semester program. NP curriculum includes didactic and clinical courses. Clinical courses require more resources and faculty oversight, and are generally significantly more costly than didactic courses. While the DNP program requires an additional 3 semesters, those additional courses will mostly be didactic courses, and most of the resource intensive courses are already existing in the current MSN/NP curriculum. Transitioning to the DNP program may not require as much additional resources as some may expect. Also, doctoral programs generally command a higher tuition. This can partially offset the increased cost of the program. Furthermore, in anticipation of the transition to DNP/NP program, DON has been strategically recruiting doctorally prepared faculty members for the NP program. Currently, all full time NP faculty members are doctorally prepared.

Because of its outstanding program outcomes, the FNP program at CSUB has received approximately $3.5 million in state and federal grant funding to increase the health care workforce. In addition, the FNP program has received strong community support, including a $450,000 donation from Dignity Health and $100,000 from Dr. Kasselman Fund. We are confident that our community will continue to support the NP program, especially if it transitions to a doctoral program.

12. a. Description of Campus Approval Process
b. Approval Signatures
The Doctor of Nursing Practice Degree: Entry to Nurse Practitioner Practice by 2025

May 2018

On April 20, 2018, the National Organization of Nurse Practitioner Faculties (NONPF) made the commitment to move all entry-level nurse practitioner (NP) education to the DNP degree by 2025. Today, there are more than 300 DNP programs throughout the United States (US) (AACN, 2018), and NONPF has led the evolution of NP educational preparation to the DNP degree level (NONPF, 2015). NONPF maintains its dedication to all currently credentialed NPs and faculty members; however, we recognize that as the health care delivery system has grown increasingly complex, the role of NPs has evolved. The DNP degree reflects the rigorous education that NPs receive to lead and deliver quality health care.

NONPF supports a seamless, integrated DNP curriculum without a master’s exit point as preparation for entry to the NP role (NONPF, 2015; NONPF, 2016). The DNP NP curriculum is not an add-on to the master’s curriculum; instead, the curriculum integrates objectives and learning opportunities for students to achieve the NP core and population-focused competencies that are written for doctoral-level education (NONPF, 2013; NONPF, 2017a; NONPF and AACN, 2016). There are currently 187 post-baccalaureate DNP NP programs in the US, a 24% increase since 2015 (AACN, 2018). NONPF is committed to providing resources and support for faculty members as they embrace curricular changes (NONPF 2016).

Moving all entry-level NP education to the DNP degree by 2025 will take commitment from multiple stakeholders and development of strategies and initiatives yet to be determined. In December 2017, NONPF hosted a DNP summit with stakeholders from nearly 20 national organizations to have a critical dialogue about moving entry-level NP education to the DNP degree by 2025 (NONPF, 2017b). While not all participants agreed that the DNP should be the entry level degree for NP practice, everyone agreed to continue the dialogue, stay actively engaged, and take the information back to their organizations. Moving forward, NONPF will continue to work with the DNP Summit participants and additional organizations and stakeholders, as they are critically important to realizing our goal.

As the preeminent leader in NP education that provides timely and critical resources for NP educators, NONPF moves forward with an unwavering commitment to create innovative, high quality educational resources to NP faculty during this transition. Our work will lead and unite NP educators to transform healthcare.

Approved by the NONPF Board of Directors, April 2018.
References


MEMORANDUM

Date: August 13, 2018

To: CSU Presidents

From: Alison M. Wrynn, Ph.D.
Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs and Faculty Development and Interim State University Dean, Academic Programs

Subject: Policy Changes: Doctor of Nursing Practice Title 5 Regulations

At the May 15, 2018 meeting, the California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees adopted changes to Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. The amendments to administrative law governing the CSU address the CSU Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) degree programs. The amendments reflect changes brought about by Assembly Bill 422 California State University: Doctor of Nursing Practice Degree Program (Arambula), which was signed by Governor Brown on October 12, 2017. These changes to Title 5 have now been posted; a revised EO 1067 Doctor of Nursing Practice Programs, based on these amendments to Title 5, is in the process of being finalized and will be distributed later this month.

If you have questions, please contact me at (562) 951-4672 or awrynn@calstate.edu.

Enclosure

c: Dr. Loren J. Blanchard, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs
Associate Provosts/Associate Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs
Deans of Graduate Studies
Deans of Health Sciences
Directors of Nursing
Dr. Catherine Nelson, Chair, Academic Senate, CSU
§ 40050.2. Function: Instruction Leading to the Doctor of Nursing Practice Degree.

Notwithstanding Section 40050, the Doctor of Nursing Practice degree may be awarded independently of any other institution of higher education, provided that the program satisfies the criteria of Section 40513 and Section 40514. NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 66040, 66040, 89030, 89035, 89280 and 89281, Education Code. Reference: Sections 89280 and 89281, Education Code.

§ 40100.1. Cooperative Curricula.

Curricula leading to the bachelor’s, master’s, or doctoral degree may be established cooperatively by two or more campuses. The Chancellor is authorized to establish and from time to time revise such procedures as may be appropriate for the administration of this section. NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 66600, 89030, and 89035, Education Code. Reference: Sections 66040, 66042, 66600, 89030, 89280 and 89281, Education Code.

§ 40513. The Doctor of Nursing Practice Degree.

(a) California State University programs leading to a Doctor of Nursing Practice degree shall be distinguished from a University of California Doctor of Philosophy in Nursing program.
(b) California State University Doctor of Nursing Practice degree programs shall conform to the following criteria:
(1) The clinical degree programs in advanced nursing practice shall prepare graduates for leadership and clinical roles and to engage in evidence-based inquiry; and programs may also prepare graduates to serve as faculty in postsecondary nursing education programs.

(2) Programs shall be consistent with the requirements of a professional nursing accrediting body and the regional accrediting association.

(c) Each campus offering a program leading to a Doctor of Nursing Practice degree shall establish requirements for admission to the program. The requirements for admission shall include, at a minimum, the requirements stated in Section 41021.

(d) Programs leading to the Doctor of Nursing Practice degree shall conform to the following specifications:

(1) The curriculum may be organized as a cohort-based program and shall include learning experiences that balance research, theory, and practice. The core curriculum for each DNP program shall provide professional preparation in advanced nursing practice, including but not be limited to theory, application and evaluation of research findings, curriculum development and evaluation, professional practice, management and leadership, and essential curricular concepts for advanced nursing at the doctoral level.

(2) The pattern of study for the post-bachelor’s degree in nursing to the Doctor of Nursing Practice degree program shall include at least 27 semester units in courses organized primarily for doctoral students, and the remaining units required for the degree shall be in courses organized for specialty advanced nursing coursework as identified by national nursing specialty certification agencies. No more than 12 semester doctoral project units shall be allowed toward the degree program requirements.

(3) The pattern of study for the post-master’s Doctor of Nursing Practice degree program shall be composed of at least 36 semester units earned in graduate standing. At least 27 semester units required for the degree shall be in courses organized primarily for doctoral students, and the remaining units required for the degree shall be in courses organized primarily for doctoral students or courses organized primarily for master’s and doctoral students.

(4) At least 80 percent of required Doctor of Nursing Practice semester units shall be completed in residence at the campus awarding the degree or campuses jointly awarding the degree. The appropriate campus authority may authorize the substitution of credit earned by alternate means for part of this residence requirement. The campus may establish a policy allowing the transfer of relevant coursework and credits completed as a matriculated student in another graduate program, on the condition that the other program is appropriately accredited.

(5) A doctoral qualifying examination or assessment shall be required.

(6) The pattern of study shall include completion of a doctoral project.

(A) The doctoral project shall be the written product of a systematic, rigorous, evidence-based endeavor focused on a significant nursing practice issue. The doctoral project is expected to contribute to an improvement in professional practices, policy,
or patient outcomes. It shall evidence originality, critical and independent thinking, appropriate form and organization, and adequate rationale.
(B) The doctoral project shall reflect a command of the scholarly literature and shall demonstrate the student’s mastery of evidence-based practice at the doctoral level.
(C) The written component of the doctoral project shall be organized in an appropriate form and shall identify the problem statement and purpose, state the major theoretical perspectives, explain the significance of the undertaking, relate it to the relevant scholarly and professional literature, identify the methods of gathering and analyzing the data, and offer a conclusion or recommendation.
(D) No more than 12 semester units shall be allowed for the doctoral project.
(E) An oral presentation of the doctoral project shall be required.

Title 5, California Code of Regulations
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Chapter 1 – California State University
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Article 7 – Graduate Degrees

§ 40514. The Doctor of Nursing Practice Degree: Requirements.

(a) To be eligible for the Doctor of Nursing Practice degree, the candidate shall have completed a program of study that includes a qualifying assessment and a doctoral project and that is consistent with the specifications in subdivision (d) of Section 40513 and that is approved by the appropriate campus authority. A grade point average of 3.0 (grade of B) or better shall have been earned in courses taken to satisfy the requirements for the degree, except that a course in which no letter grade is assigned shall not be used in computing the grade point average.
(b) Advancement to Candidacy. For advancement to candidacy for the Doctor of Nursing Practice degree, the student shall have achieved classified graduate standing and met such particular requirements as the Chancellor and the appropriate campus authority may prescribe. The requirements shall include a qualifying assessment.
(c) The student shall have completed all requirements for the degree within five years of matriculation into the doctoral program. The appropriate campus authority may extend by up to two years the time for completion of the requirements under the following circumstances;
(1) the student is in good standing,
(2) the extension is warranted by compelling individual circumstances, and
(3) the student demonstrates current knowledge of research and practice in advanced nursing practice, as required by the campus.
Title 5, California Code of Regulations  
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§ 41021. Admission to Doctor of Nursing Practice Programs.

An applicant may be admitted with classified graduate standing to a program leading to a Doctor of Nursing Practice degree established pursuant to Section 40513 if the applicant satisfies the requirements of each of the following numbered subdivisions:

1. The applicant holds an acceptable bachelor's degree in nursing or master's degree in nursing earned at an institution accredited by a regional accrediting association and a national professional accrediting association, as applicable; or the applicant has completed equivalent academic preparation as determined by the appropriate campus authority.

2. The applicant has attained a cumulative grade point average of at least 3.0 in an acceptable bachelor's degree in nursing or master's degree in nursing as determined by the appropriate campus authority.

3. The applicant maintains active licensure to practice as a registered nurse in the state in which practicum experiences will be completed.

4. The applicant meets all requirements for credentialing or certification eligibility as appropriate to the nursing specialty area.

5. The applicant has demonstrated sufficient preparation and experience pertinent to nursing practice to be successful in doctoral education.

6. The applicant has met any additional requirements established by the chancellor and any additional requirements prescribed by the appropriate campus authority.

Campus Climate Committee

Adopted TBD

Intent
The intent of the Campus Climate Committee is to support the university with recommendations and advice for cultivating a campus community that champions diversity, equity and inclusion.

Purpose
The purpose of the Campus Climate Committee is to improve the inclusivity of the campus environment by providing advice on how the university can implement meaningful institutional change.

Objectives
The objectives of the Campus Climate Committee are to:

1. Develop a University Diversity and Inclusion Action Plan and monitor its progress.
2. Identify barriers to achieving greater diversity, equity, and inclusivity at CSUB and provide recommendations on how to overcome those barriers.
3. Monitor the campus climate and recommend changes based upon findings.
4. Coordinate, communicate and collaborate on diversity, equity and inclusion efforts across the university.

Membership
The membership of the Campus Climate Committee shall consist of the following, or their respective designee:

1. Chief Diversity Officer & Special Assistant to the President, facilitator
2. Faculty representative #1, appointed by Academic Senate
3. Faculty representative #2, appointed by Academic Senate
4. Student representative, appointed by Associated Students Inc.
5. Student representative, appointed by Associated Students Inc.
6. Staff representative 1, appointed by staff
7. Staff representative 2, appointed by staff
8. MPP representative, appointed by MPP
9. Student Affairs representative, appointed by Vice President for Student Affairs
10. Athletics Representative, appointed by Director of Athletics
11. Community Member, appointed by University President

Meetings
The meetings of the Campus Climate Committee shall be at least twice per semester, with additional meetings scheduled as requested by the Campus Climate Committee Facilitator.
## Campus Climate Committee
### Members and Terms
#### November 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative Group</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term of Service</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Diversity Officer</td>
<td>Claudia Catota</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Representative #1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Representative #2**</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>***1 year initial term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Representative #1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Representative #2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Representative #1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Representative #2**</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>**1 year initial term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPP Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Member</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Office</td>
<td>Jorge Villatoro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support for Diversity Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Office</td>
<td>Ana Santos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support for Diversity Action Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>