ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE Extra
Agenda
Tuesday, December 8, 2020
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
Videoconference

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK
   Curricular Forms, Academic Programs, L. Zuzarte – (Time Certain 10:15)

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   December 1, 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

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. Spring All-Faculty Meeting (Feb 8?) - EC
   b. MA INST Moratorium (handout) - AAC
   c. UPRC Changes (handout) – AAC, BPC
   d. Handbook 306.2.2.e (handout) - FAC
   e. Elections and Appointments (handout) – M. Danforth
      i. School Elections Committees
      ii. Committee proliferation
      iii. Campus Climate Committee interest (handout)
      iv. HSIRB re-appointment (handout)
   f. EEGO course offerings – Summer Term (Unit Limits) - AAC
   g. FYS Instructors and GECCo structure (handout) – FAC, BPC, AAC, AS&SS?
   h. Post-Tenure Review Requirements - FAC

1
i. Campus Data Needs - BPC
j. Syllabi Accessibility (handout) - AAC
k. Faculty Poll regarding online instruction (Hold pending further information)
l. Alma Mater (Hold pending further investigation)

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING DECEMBER 10, 2020** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   
   **Announcements**
   
   President Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10)
   Faust Gorham (Time Certain 10:30)
   
   **Approval of Agenda** (Time Certain 10:05)

   **Reports**

   **Resolutions**

   Consent Agenda
   - [RES 202114](#) Graduation Fall 2020

   New Business
   - [RES 202113](#) Academic Master Plan 2021-22 through 2029-30
   - [RES 202115](#) Proposal for a Bachelor of Science in Public Health

   Old Business
   - [RES 202110](#) Academic Calendar Fall ’20 Spring ’21 Fall ’21 Spring ’22 Summer ’22

   Open Forum and Wellness Check (Time Certain 11:15)
   
   Past Senate Chair, J. Stark (Time Certain 11:20)

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

9. **ADJOURNMENT**
ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, December 1, 2020
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
Videoconference

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

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK
   o Institution Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA) – K. Krishnan retired today. M. Malhotra is the Interim AVP IRPA. Today is her first day. Prior to coming to CSUB, she was responsible for systemwide data collection management; business intelligence; online learning, distance education; teacher education; transfer pathway – Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT); access-denied eligible; academic performance. She aims to develop a data culture at CSUB. She will listen to understand the champions of the campus. It takes time to have discussion from the whole group to see how to use big data for the benefit of the students. A. Hegde welcomed her to campus and thanked her for joining the meeting.
   o M. Martinez is attending the ASCSU’s Advancing Equity and Diversity Initiative meeting.
   o J. Millar is attending an ASCSU meeting.
   o The Senate and Standing Committee meetings dates have been swapped. The Senators and frequent visitors have been informed. A campus wide message will be sent. The Standing Committees are meeting December 3. The Academic Senate is meeting December 10.
   o All Faculty Meeting – February 8, 2021. The plan is to have a moderated discussion and debrief on the transition to virtual instruction. M. Danforth said the time demands of the workload have eeked into all areas of her life and she expects that others feel the same. It would be good for it to be recognized.
   o The Winter Session Proposal – M. Novak contacted A. Hegde to withdraw the proposal based on a student survey which produced mixed results. AAC and BPC to
pause on Referral #9 Expanded Winter Session until receipt of the formal notification of withdrawal. Winter Session will continue as it has been scheduled.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   C. Lam moved to approve the November 17, 2020 Minutes. B. Street seconded. Approved.

4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
   B. Street moved to approve the agenda. C. Lam seconded. Approved.

5. **CONTINUED ITEMS**
   a. **AS Log (handout)**
      i. **AAC (R. Gearhart)** In addition to the seven referrals in committee, A. Rodriguez mentioned that there are many proposals in the pipeline regarding Interdisciplinary and Ethnic Studies courses. There is a moratorium on MA INST. The committee will prioritize things that can be done quickly.
      ii. **AS&SS (C. Lam)** He and M. Rees invited F. Gorham to discuss Referral # 15 Ally Software at a joint December 3 meeting.
      iii. **FAC (M. Rees)** The committee received four new referrals at the last EC meeting. They’ll focus on Referral #6 CSUB Patent Policy and reach out to I. Ebong before he retires.
      iv. **BPC (B. Street)** Referral #9 Winter Session will be paused. Referral # 3 Institutional Research in Response to WSCUC Report, to be fair to the management transition, the committee to look at it in the Spring. The four remaining referrals, # 13 BS in Public Health, #12 Proposal for MS in Accounting, # 14 Proposal for ES Department, and # 18 AMP are related to another sub-committees. The EC identified the AMP as the priority.
   A. Hegde is considering setting-up a calendar for the Senate business. Requests for program approval, new degree proposal, AMP, etc. would be submitted by a specific date to cycle through the committee review process within the academic year. The EC will look at establishing a business calendar in the Spring.
   b. **Provost Update – V. Harper**
      i. **Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 Update** – The CO met with all the Presidents last week about the dramatic increase in COVID-19 cases. To mitigate the spread, CSUB will be 1) conducting all Fall 2020 finals online and 2) virtual until Feb 1, 2021. The first week of the Spring 2021 semester, including hybrid classes, will be virtual. R. Gearhart said that Kern County Department of Public Health is a month behind on notifying people for contact tracing. V. Harper said the CO provided no rational why hybrid courses are going virtual.
It was the direction by the CO. A. Hegde shared that some campuses have delayed starting their Spring term. They’re adjusting their Academic Calendar to eliminate Spring Break or create mini breaks. The President asked the CO for an exception. Perhaps faculty could be given options. C. Lam said that the CSUB COVID-19 dashboard has not been updated in two weeks.

ii. Academic Master Plan 2021-2022 through 2029-2030 - Thank you for moving it forward.

iii. RTP Levels of Review – RES 192019 gave the President authority to delegate RTP to the Provost. Faculty Affairs decided operationally that it should be an annual delegation, not a permanent delegation. The President can delegate some or all of the files. There will be a formal letter of delegation for a period of time. The Provost will request an annual delegation. A. Hegde agreed it was a good process. There are 68 files for review this year.

c. Searches

i. Interim Associate Dean NSME – V. Harper put for a name under consideration. D. Boschini said that the relationship between that person’s department and the Dean’s office has been discussed at the NSME chairs meeting. That person has been a good colleague. She supports the candidate under consideration. V. Harper learned from being offered the Interim position two years ago, embrace change. It is occurring in IRPA, the School of NSME, and GRaSP.

d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – Pandemic Budget Task Force (PBTF) – M. Rees said there is one more meeting. The group is aiming for providing recommendations and concluding the task force. B. Street said that the committee needed to come to a point of decision on recommendations, as alluded to by M. Rees. V. Harper said that the collaboration and the results are outstanding. The Governor will give guidance on the budget in January. The CSUs asked for a $400 million increase, and is hoping for no worse than a flat budget. Each of the academic areas have been asked to produce 15% reduction scenarios. Given the planning, CSUB is well positioned to ensure that our educational mission is protected.

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Fall Finals – V. Harper – see Provost Update.

b. GRaSP Faculty Role – V. Harper has had discussions with PIs and other divisions in the university. He plans to have a strategic review of GRaSP in the Spring. Discussion of people to include in the consultation ensued. B. Pratt has agreed to be part of it. He is respected. V. Harper asked for additional names. D.
Boschini suggested H. He. She has a lot of experience on grants and is a productive, forward-thinking person, communicates ideas well, and is easy to work with. M. Rees said that A. Jacobsen has good, insightful thoughts. C. Lam suggested K. LaGue, however she’s on sabbatical. M. Danforth suggested someone who has been PI with National Science Foundation (NSF) grants; she and C. Lam have the experience. Also, J. Talamantes was the lead on some of the U.S. Department of Education Engineering Science grants, then L. Cabrales took over in Physics. They shared several of those multi-million-dollar grants. M. Martinez has said a lot about GRaSP in prior meetings. V. Harper will get a message out to faculty.

c. APM Proposal – GECCo – Editorial changes in terms of language from CARS to GECCo are needed. Look at the process. Referred to AAC.

d. Curricular Forms – M. Danforth noticed that the new forms have technical issues that need to be addressed with ITS. It is also very time consuming to complete them due to the load lag of the Word documents and the duplicity between the New Course Form fields and what’s already in the track changes catalog copy documents and memos that department chairs submit to the curriculum committees. It would take four hours to go through the New Course forms versus fifteen minutes using the old forms. There were a lot of questions on what certain fields meant. The course description is limited to 40 words. If that’s a limitation in PeopleSoft, we need a website description instead. A. Hegde also found problems with the documents, including the PDF version of the form. Making it easier for Academic Operations should not mean a transfer of workload to department chairs. Before, BPA would submit a track changes document along with a clean document. The chair wrote a memo. Forms were approved. Consider a referral on the implementation of resolutions whereby a column is inserted to follow-up with the people on the distribution list. B. Street said that it’s more of a procedural issue. The rationale to RES 192024 was in part, on being effective and providing support. It’s not being taken care of in terms of implementing the resolution. The mechanism and procedures need to be made effective. A. Hegde said RES 192024 passed on May 7. D. Boschini recalled that the issue was the overwhelming amount of detail that needed to be evaluated in a short period time. There wasn’t enough time to try it out. A. Hegde suggested that 1) refer back to AAC and invite L. Zuzarte to attend, or 2) next DCLC get feedback from other department chairs. If it’s not working, revisit the resolution. M. Danforth suggested that conversations need to occur now, because the catalog deadline is in two weeks. Understand that this is a transition year and the number of catalog changes and the time it takes has required that she has to put aside certain lower-priority tasks to just get grades done for her Fall courses. Faculty is under a huge amount of strain with these virtual operations. We need some leeway and kindness. A. Hegde had to work on the forms through the Thanksgiving break. D. Boschini said the Nursing Department is on fire and she hasn’t been able to look at it. It may be best to
tell L. Zuzarte that this is not going to work right now because there are too many additional layers to faculty workload right now. The implementation has been a disaster and faculty don’t have the conditions to fix this. A. Hegde said we have had extensions before. Let’s extend the deadline for the catalog. There are things we can do. He will invite L. Zuzarte to the next EC meeting to get feedback. R. Gearhart said that the last time forms were reviewed in AAC, it was a several meeting long process. There was a lot of pushback. There won’t be time for AAC to address forms in a meaningful way.

e. Catalog Changes to General Education - A. Gebauer asked A. Hegde who approves catalog revisions in GE. A. Gebauer offered two options: 1) The GE Director would make the revisions and get it approved by GECCo. Then, they would go to Academic Operations. 2) Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) which oversees the interdisciplinary aspect of the curriculum as a curriculum committee task would approve the revisions. A. Hegde recommended #1 due to the deadline, and that EC will continue to discuss the process. M. Danforth said that GECCo needs to do appropriate consultation on Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) if they are going to be revising them. If they do that on Area B without consulting NSME, or if they revise Area C without consulting A&H, then there is a breakdown in communication which we would be within the oversight of the Senate. Their purview is courses and course changes. It’s important to get clarification on the boundaries and what changes GECCo wants to make. A. Hegde said A. Gebauer asked which body approves catalog copy. He wants formal referral on catalog copy preparation and approval to GE revisions by the Director of GECCo. A. Hegde said that the EC didn’t get involved in previous catalog revisions. M. Danforth questioned what is in the catalog copy because the courses are under each individual department. The unit structure (table) came from Academic Operations when the campus transitioned from quarters to semesters. Department chairs were given a template on what the catalog should look like. From her perspective, the course changes and the department catalog description are signed off by GECCo. There is some section in academic policies about GE. Changes to that section typically goes to AAC. A. Hegde doesn’t see anything substantial. He will ask A. Gebauer to send a copy of the revisions made. It should reflect what GECCo is doing. Other than the structure of GE, the Senate has given GECCo authority over the GE curriculum. The EC wants to look at what GECCo has done to catalog revisions. If there is anything of concern there, it will be addressed. Currently, other than the GE Director’s reporting to the Senate, GECCo is completely independent of the Senate. GECCo should have been made a Senate committee, reporting to the Senate as all other academic committees do. The Senate will look at a GECCo restructuring in Spring 2021. The appeals process, where one goes to make changes, etc. needs to be codified. M. Danforth said that Academic Programs sub-page spells-out the structure. It still has A4 instead of what the CO directed to be named as B4, and it needs updates reflecting resolutions made recently. A. Hegde said the
changes may be minor. It’s good practice to have a copy of the revisions sent to the EC.
f. UPRC Changes – AAC, BPC (deferred)
g. Handbook 306.2.2.e – FAC (deferred)
h. Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth (deferred)
   i. School Elections Committees
   ii. Committee proliferation
   iii. Campus Climate Committee Appointments
i. EEGO course offerings – Summer Term (Unit Limits) – AAC (deferred)
j. FYS Instructors and GECCo structure – FAC, BPC, AAC, AS&SS (deferred)
k. Post-Tenure Review Requirements – FAC (deferred)
l. Campus Data Needs – BPC (deferred)
m. Syllabi Accessibility (handout) – AAC (deferred)
n. Faculty Poll regarding online instruction (Hold pending further information)
o. Alma Mater (Hold pending further investigation)
p. MA INST Moratorium (deferred)

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING DECEMBER 10, 2020 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   Announcements
   President Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10)
   Approval of Agenda (Time Certain 10:05)
   Reports
   Consent Agenda
   RES Graduation Fall 2020
   New Business
   RES 202113 Academic Master Plan 2021-22 through 2029-30
   Old Business
   RES 202110 Academic Calendar Fall ‘20 Spring ‘21 Fall ‘21 Spring ‘22 Summer ‘22
   Open Forum and Wellness Check (Time Certain 11:15)
   Past Senate Chair, J. Stark (Time Certain 11:20)

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR
   None.

9. ADJOURNMENT
   A. Hegde adjourned the meeting at 11:30.
# Academic Affairs Committee: Richard Gearhart/Chair, meets 10:00am via Zoom

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/1/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 16 Program Review Process Improvement</td>
<td>Carry-over Addendum 8/25/20</td>
<td>AAC 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>2019-2020 Referral 18 Interdisciplinary BS Degree in Public Health Proposal</td>
<td>First Reading 12/10/20</td>
<td>AAC, BPC The demand, structure, and resources required to deliver effectively and efficiently. Returned to proposers with comments on what needs to be improved. Do the courses have a home and would the Curriculum Committees approve before it comes back to AAC. RES 202115 Proposal for a Bachelor of Science in Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 02 2020-2021 Referral 13 BS in Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>AAC, BPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 13 BS in Public Health</td>
<td>First Reading 12/10/20</td>
<td>First Reading 12/10/20 AAC, BPC Program rationale, existing resources, additional resources required. RES 202108 Proposal for Master of Science in Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 01 Master of Science in Computer Science</td>
<td>Withdrawal by M. Novak 12/1/20</td>
<td>AAC, BPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 09 Expanded Winter Session</td>
<td>Withdrawal by M. Novak 12/1/20</td>
<td>AAC, BPC Examine whether or not the current CSUB Winter Session, based on the calendar, is a sufficient instructional period, faculty workload issues, and impact on student financial aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 10 Course Repetition</td>
<td></td>
<td>AAC, BPC Examine relevance of data from the Academic Petitions Committee and whether policy is needed for how many times a student can repeat an individual course for forgiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 11 Review of Ethnic Studies Unit Implementation Task Force Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td>AAC, BPC Whether the (4) recommendations meet the implementation guidelines proposed by the Chancellor's Office in their memo dated October 8, including the changes to the CSU GE Breadth Requirements. RES 202109 Changes to the GE Breadth Requirement – Ethnic Studies</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>11/17/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 14 Proposal for the Creation of Ethnic Studies Department</td>
<td>AAC, BPC, FAC</td>
<td>Consider rationale, resources, additional support, and how creation of new dept. affects current RTP process for impacted faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 18 AMP 2021-2022 through 2029-2030 First Reading 12/10/20</td>
<td>AAC, BPC</td>
<td>The rationale behind adding a Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)/ Nurse Practitioner (NP) Program RES 202113 AMP 2021-2022 through 2029-2030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Academic Support and Student Services: Charles Lam /Chair, meets 10:00 via Zoom video conference

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/6/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 10 Course Repetition</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 15 Ally Software Pilot</td>
<td>AS&amp;SS, FAC Examine eight issues pertaining to software pilot and implementation planning.</td>
<td></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>08/27/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 08 Honorary Doctorate-Handbook Change</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td>FAC Refer to RES 121329 Procedures for Honorary Doctorate Nominations and Selection REVISED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 02 Criteria and Nomination Process for Faculty Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC Define meritorious, pressure from senior faculty, confidentiality of process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 04 Office Hours Policy</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>FAC Clarify the language in Handbook 303.1.3, How to hold office hours via videoconference, Censure or penalty for missing office hours. RES 202106 Office Hours Policy During Mandated Remote Delivery</td>
<td>09/17/20</td>
<td>09/25/20</td>
<td>10/01/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 05 CFA President or Designee on FAC-Bylaws Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC The CFA President’s knowledge of existing contracts, and emerging issues at the campus and system levels. Whether the position is voting or ex-officio member RES 202107 CFA President or Designee on FAC – Bylaws Change</td>
<td>10/01/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 07 Fall Classroom Observations</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>FAC Decision needs to be made before second year of RTP files on whether to have mandatory observation and the option to include in RTP, etc. RES 202105 Fall Classroom Observations During Mandatory Remote Delivery</td>
<td>09/17/20</td>
<td>09/25/20</td>
<td>10/01/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/08/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 08 Notification to Chairs of Assigned Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC Specifying the appropriate timing and notification to the department chair and how the coordination with AA and HR can improve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 15 Ally Software Pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td>AS&amp;SS, FAC Examine eight issues pertaining to software pilot and implementation planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 14 Proposal for the Creation of Ethnic Studies Department</td>
<td></td>
<td>AAC, BPC, FAC Consider rationale, resources, additional support, and how creation of new dept. affects current RTP process for impacted faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 16 URC Recommendations – Handbook Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAC Consider recommendations put forth by the URC and other issues FAC finds that need improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 17 Sabbatical Application Process Improvement</td>
<td>FAC Identify what is different or extra between the 1) Faculty Information Bulletin 2) Application Cover Sheet, 3) Handbook with directions for the applicant and 4) directions for the evaluating committee and then make consistent between them.</td>
<td></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>Approved by Senate</td>
<td>AAC BPC 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>Withdrawn by M. Novak 12/1/20</td>
<td>BPC Feedback from CO, access and permissions to data, what faculty needs, what data department chairs' need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 09 Expanded Winter Session</td>
<td>Withdrawn by M. Novak 12/1/20</td>
<td>AAC BPC Examine whether or not the current CSUB Winter Session, based on the calendar, is a sufficient instructional period, faculty workload issues, and impact on student financial aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 18 Interdisciplinary BS Degree in Public Health</td>
<td>First Reading 12/10/20</td>
<td>AAC, BPC The demand, structure, and resources required to deliver effectively and efficiently. Returned to proposers with comments on what needs to be improved. Do the courses have a home and would the Curriculum Committees approve before it comes back to AAC. RES 202115 Proposal for a Bachelor of Science in Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 13 BS in Public Health</td>
<td>First Reading 12/10/20</td>
<td>AAC, BPC 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 Accounting</td>
<td>Approved by Senate</td>
<td>AAC, BPC The demand, structure, and resources required to deliver effectively and efficiently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 14 Proposal for the Creation of Ethnic Studies Department</td>
<td>Approved by Senate</td>
<td>AAC, BPC, FAC Consider rationale, resources, additional support, and how creation of new dept. affects current RTP process for impacted faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 18 AMP 2021-2022 through 2029-2030</td>
<td>First Reading 12/10/20</td>
<td>AAC, BPC The rationale behind adding a Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)/ Nurse Practitioner (NP) Program RES 202113 AMP 2021-2022 through 2029-2030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 current WSCUC guidelines and collected data on the program review process at other CSUs. Dr. Sun then used this information to recommend changes to CSUB program review documents, identify issues of concern in academic program review at CSUB, and propose recommendations for improving academic program review at CSUB.

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

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

8. Added a section on Repository and Reporting.

9. In the “Procedures for Programs with External Accreditation” section, clarified procedures for program review of accredited programs.

10. Added a section on mid-cycle reports.

11. Added a section on extensions and late program reviews.

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

Attachments to this document include:

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

Please use the above documents to inform your decisions and recommendations. Do not hesitate to contact us if you require any further information.
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 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 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 (within a reasonable time period) for factual inaccuracies.
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Office of Academic Programs to become part of the package of documents subsequently reviewed by the appropriate school dean, the UPRC, and the Provost.

SCHOOL DEAN REVIEW

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

UNIVERSITY REVIEW

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

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

PROVOST REVIEW

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

ANNUAL REPORTS

ANNUAL REPORTS

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

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

REPOSITORY AND REPORTING

Copies of all annual report and program review documents shall be maintained in the office of Academic Affairs. At the end of the academic year, the AVPAA shall prepare a summary of the major findings, recommendations and budgetary allotments for all programs reviewed that year.

PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAMS WITH EXTERNAL ACCREDITATION

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

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

PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM REVIEW EXTENSIONS

Under extenuating circumstances, a program may request a one-semester extension of its program review. The request must include a justification for the extension, and an acknowledgement of the school dean. Upon receiving the request, the UPRC will discuss and vote on it, and the UPRC Chair will notify the program if the request is approved.

When programs have not submitted a self-study after one year of their initial deadline, the UPRC shall meet with the Provost, the program director or department chair, and appropriate school dean(s) to decide how to proceed. An additional extension may be granted if appropriate, or the UPRC may elect to proceed with the program review without a self-study prepared by the program.
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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决策 letter, and other relevant material. In addition, programs should indicate to the UPRC where the required information for campus program review is located in the accreditation reports. For any items of the program review that are not addressed in the external accreditation reports, programs will need to provide the information in a separate response and submit it to the UPRC. Additionally, the school dean must submit a review if not involved in the accreditation process. Once these documents are received, the UPRC will review the material and produce a report, followed by the Provost review that culminates in a MOUAP.

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

**PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM REVIEW EXTENSIONS**

Under extenuating circumstances, a program may request a one-semester extension of its program review. The request must include a justification for the extension, and an acknowledgement of the school dean. Upon receiving the request, the UPRC will discuss and vote on it, and the UPRC Chair will notify the program if the request is approved.

When programs have not submitted a self-study after one year of their initial deadline, the UPRC shall meet with the Provost, the program director or department chair, and appropriate school dean(s) to decide how to proceed. An additional extension may be granted if appropriate, or the UPRC may elect to proceed with the program review without a self-study prepared by the program.
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# 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 resultant 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. Program review may include focus groups or conversations with students to follow up on results of surveys.</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>
<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>
<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>
</table>
| Annual Report to Senate | - 2010-2011 to 2019-2020  
- No 2013-2014  
- No 2015-2016 | - 2010-2011 to 2018-2019  
- No 2013-2014  
- No 2015-2016  
- No 2019-2020  
| Archives | a. Additional documents-2016-17  
- UPRC Charge  
- UPRC concerns: see Draft 2 | Archives (No folder) |
| | b. Agenda-Minutes 2010-2018  
Agendas:  
- Agendas for 2012-13: in the folders of 2011-12 and 2013-14 agenda folders; also available in UPRC → Archives → Program Reviews → 2012 13 Program Reviews → 2012 13 Agenda’s  
- 2015-16 Agendas: incomplete  
- No separate folder for 2016-2017 agendas; 2016-2017 agendas are in the folder of “Minutes 2016-2017”  
- No separate folder for 2018-19 agendas; 2018-19 agendas are in the folder of “Minutes 2018-2019”  
Minutes:  
- Incomplete minutes: 2011-2012, 2015-2016,  
- No minutes for 2012-13  
- 2018-19 minutes for Spring 2019 semester are in “UPRC Meeting Agenda-Minutes 2019-2020 folder” | |
| | c. Completed reviews  
- Arts 2010-2011 Review  
- Computer Science Review 2010-11  
- PEAK  
- PPA 2010-2011 Review  
Information in this folder is duplicate, which is available in UPRC → Reviews by Program. | |
| | d. Correspondence | |
| | e. External reviewer information | |
| | f. General UPRC letterhead | |
| | g. Memo’s | |
| | h. MOUAP Archives  
- MOUAP template  
- Signed MOUAPs | |
| | i. Procedures | |
| | j. Program Review Process | |
| | k. Program Review Templates 2016-17 | |
| | l. Program Reviews  
- Program Reviews by year (2009-10 – 2017-18) | |
- Duplicate; files are also available in UPRC →Reviews by Program
- 2014 15 Program Reviews folder – MSA Administration (online): includes two different files from those in Reviews by Program - _Administration 2015 16 [suggestion: Include two files in the Reviews by Program folder]
- 2016 17 Program Reviews folder – MA Educational Administration: suggestion: include a folder on MAEA in Reviews by Program folder under “Education MA”
- 2016 17 Program Reviews folder:
  - also includes 2016-17 meeting agendas and minutes (9/28/2016 – 5/8/2017)
  - also includes UPRC Workshop 2-10-17 (including agenda, PPT, eval forms)
- 2017 18 Program Reviews folder:
  - Also includes 2017 18 Meetings (Agendas: 10/2/2017 – 5/7/2018; Minutes: 9/25/2017 – 5/14/2018)

- Program scans
- Thank you letters
- Trend analysis
- UPRC Committee
- UPRC Grid
- UPRC letterhead Contains same information as in General UPRC Letterhead folder (see f)
- UPRC Previous committee members
  - contains same but less information as in UPRC Committee (see p)
- WASC
- Welcome letters
- Welcome letters(1)
  - contains same but less information as in Welcome Letters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Cycle Report</td>
<td>Folder called “Mid-Cycle Report 8-21-19” 2 files, same document, one in Word, one in PDF</td>
<td>1 file in PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUAP Template</td>
<td>Yes 1 file in Word</td>
<td>No folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUAP</td>
<td>No separate folder  [Signed MOUAPs are in UPRC →Archives →MOUAP Archives]</td>
<td>18 files; signed MOUAPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Review Procedures and Templates</td>
<td>- Program Review Progress Report: 2 files, same, one in Word, one in PDF - The rest are same.</td>
<td>- No Program Review Progress Report - The rest are same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Review Progress Report</td>
<td>1 file in PDF</td>
<td>No folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Review Taskforce</td>
<td>No Folder</td>
<td>1 file: Program_Review_Taskforce_ Notes_04_18_2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Review</td>
<td>2 files, same, one in Word, one in PDF</td>
<td>No folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Template with Timeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templates</td>
<td>No Folder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 files: MOUAP Template (2011-12 to 2016-17) + Program_Review_Template 2 (1/17/2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews by Program</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 folders + 1 File</td>
<td>No Folder; Individual program review listed separately in its own folder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration: Mixed up</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folder of Administration in Completed Reviews folder. This is for the online MSA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Studies</td>
<td>Same PDF files + 1 PDF “BS in Applied Studies RES031”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Studies (No Folder)</td>
<td>In Completed Reviews folder. No “BS in Applied Studies RES031”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA and MA Spanish</td>
<td>same PDF files + 1 more Word File – “Notification”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA and MA Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Art</td>
<td>same PDF files + 33 more Word/Excel Files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA CAFS</td>
<td>same PDF files + more Word/Excel files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA CAFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Communications</td>
<td>more documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives/Supporting Documents Folders are empty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Human Biological Sciences</td>
<td>same PDF Files + more Word files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Human Biological Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Liberal Studies</td>
<td>same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Liberal Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Music</td>
<td>same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Political Science</td>
<td>same PDF files + more Word files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Psychology</td>
<td>same PDF files +1 more Word file; Archives folder contains 2015-16 Social Work Folder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Psychology (NO Folder)</td>
<td>Not in Completed Reviews folder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Religious Studies</td>
<td>More files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Religious Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Documents Folder is empty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Sociology</td>
<td>same PDF files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives folder contains 2015-16 Social Work Folder.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Theatre</td>
<td>same PDF files + 1 more Word and 1 more Excel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Program</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td>Degree Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<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>
<td>BA-BS-MS Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-MA Anthropology</td>
<td>same PDF files + few more Word files</td>
<td>BA-MA Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-MA English</td>
<td>More files</td>
<td>BA-MA English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Agricultural Business</td>
<td>same PDF files + few more Word files</td>
<td>BS Agricultural Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>BS Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Computer Engineering</td>
<td>same PDF files + 1 more Word file</td>
<td>BS Computer Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Computer Science</td>
<td>same PDF files + few more Word files</td>
<td>BS Computer Science</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>
<td>BS Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>same PDF files +1 more Word file</td>
<td>BS Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Engineering Sciences</td>
<td>same PDF files + few more Word files</td>
<td>BS Engineering Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS ERM Environmental Resource Management</td>
<td>same PDF files+ more files</td>
<td>BS ERM Environmental Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Kinesiology</td>
<td>same PDF files + few more Word files</td>
<td>BS Kinesiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Mathematics</td>
<td>same + 2 MOUAP</td>
<td>BS Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Sociology</td>
<td>same + Sociology 2015 Folder in Archives folder</td>
<td>BS Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS_MS Nursing</td>
<td>Same + Nursing 3-14-16 Folder</td>
<td>BS_MS Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>General Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Counseling Psych</td>
<td>Same + 2 more Word files</td>
<td>MS Counseling Psych</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-MPA PPA</td>
<td>BA-MPA PPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same PDF files + few more Word files including UPRC Notification 1/15/2015</td>
<td>1 file re UPRC Notification 1/15/2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BA-MPA in Public Administration (No folder),**
but 1 file re UPRC Notification 1/15/2015 is included in BA-MPA PPA.

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

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

Combine all folders into 1 folder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BS Natural Sciences</th>
<th>BS Natural Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>same PDF files + more Word/Excel files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Admin</th>
<th>Business Admin (No folder)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same + More old files (1997-98, 2009-10 review cycle materials)</td>
<td>Folder of Business Admin in Completed Reviews folder.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Completed Reviews (No Separate Folder)
There is a “Completed Reviews” folder in Archives (see above in Archives section).

Email Attachments

Completed Reviews
a. Folder: Administration (see above)
b. Folder: Applied Studies (see above)
c. Folder: BA History (see below)
d. Folder: Business Administration (see above)
e. Folder: Chemistry – Biochemistry (see above)
f. Folder: Criminal Justice (see below)
g. Folder: Educational Administration (see below)
h. Folder: Educational Counseling (see below)
i. Folder: Email Attachments
   (contains two Word files: “CJ Review” (UPRC draft memo 2/6/2017) & “Communications” (UPRC notifying overdue Communications program review))
j. Folder: Global Intelligence & National Security (see below)
k. Folder: Honors Program (see below)
l. Folder: Human Biological Sciences (see above in BA Human Biological Sciences folder in SharePoint)
m. Folder: Interdisciplinary Studies (see below)

Computer and Electrical Sciences (NO Folder)
a. In the folder of Reviews by Program – BS Computer Engineering
b. In the folder of Reviews by Program – BS Electrical Engineering
c. In the folder of Reviews by Program – BS Electrical Engineering
d. In the folder of Reviews by Program – BS Engineering Sciences Supporting Documents folder

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.”

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

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

Criminal Justice (No folder)
In Completed Reviews folder
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU Accredited Programs by campus</td>
<td>Contains 1 Word file: CSU accredited programs by Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDD</td>
<td>EDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education MA</td>
<td>Contains 2010-11 Folder &amp; 1998-99 folder + other files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include a separate folder for MA Educational Administration</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No UPRC Memo (11/20/2015), which is available in SharePoint “GINS Final.”</td>
<td>In Completed Reviews folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Same + More (including info re prior reviews 1998-99, 2006-07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Program</td>
<td>MORE files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary MA</td>
<td>Same + few more files in 2003-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No UPRF draft memo, which is available in SharePoint “INSTDraft1”</td>
<td>In Completed Reviews folder; called “Interdisciplinary Studies”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Major-Inter Studies</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contains 1 Word File “InterStudies Review Notification,” which is available in Interdisciplinary MA Folder – Archives folder – Interdis 2014-15 folder</td>
<td>In Completed Reviews folder; called “SpecialMajorInterdisciplinary Studies”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combine folders into 1 folder</td>
<td></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>
</tbody>
</table>

Combine the 2015-16 Social Work folder in BOX and Social Work folder in SharePoint. Create a separate folder in BOX with the above information included.

<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>

SPED
same 3 PDF files + 1 PDF file "MOUAP SPECIAL ED 2016" SPED-Memo.2015: UPRC Memo (10/30/2015) not in Special Education folder, but in SPED folder in BOX and SharePoint.

Combine folders into 1 folder; include the above two files.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Education</th>
<th>Teacher Education (NO folder)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>In Completed Reviews folder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But the following 2 are not in Box, which are available in SharePoint:
“S Schmidt MEMO dtd 11-16-16” “Stacey letter 11-15-16”

1 File: “Questions for Reflection 9_08_11 2”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPRC Grid</th>
<th>UPRC Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Folder called “UPRC Grid 2019-2020”</td>
<td>5 files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Folders</td>
<td>Members and Term Limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2018-19: 10 files</td>
<td>No Folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2019-20: 2 files</td>
<td>4 files; 2016-2017 UPRC membership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Folder called “UPRC Grid” 3 folders:
• 18-19 UPRC Grid File: 1 file
• Grid Archives:
  o Grid from 8-9-18 to Current Folder (6 files);
  o Grid from 10-12-16 to 6-1-18 Folder (20 files + UPRC_trend_report_2013)
• Misc: 1 SharePoint Internet shortcut

Folder called “Meeting Agenda-Minutes 2019-2020,” 114 files
• Minutes: 1/31/2019-3/10/2020
• Agenda: 2/7/2019-3/3/2020

UPRC Meeting Agenda-Minutes

Folder called “Meeting Agenda-Minutes 2019-2020,”
• 2015 16 Folder: Archived Minutes and Agenda Folder + 2 Files
• 2016 17 Folder: Grid Archives Folder (Grid for Sept/Oct 2016) + 33 Files
• 2017 18 Folder: Agendas 2017 18 Folder + Minutes 2017 18 Folder + 4 Files (including UPRC Charge)
• 2018-19 Folder: agenda + minutes

UPRC Members

5 files
| UPRC Letterhead | Folder called “UPRC Official-LH-6-4-19,” 1 Word File | Folder called “UPRC Letterhead,” including  
• 2016 Letterhead Folder (4 Word files) and  
• 1 Word File for UPRC-Letterhead-6-4-19 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UPRC Review Cycle 2019</td>
<td>2 files + 1 Outlook Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| UPRC Workshops | • UPRC Workshop 2017: 20 items  
• UPRC Workshop 2018: 21 items  
• UPRC Workshop Fall 2019: 10 items  
• UPRC Workshop Spring 2019: 1 item  
• Thumbs |                                                                                      |
| Important Communications | NO folder | Folder empty |
| Other | • Two files: .DS Store and Thumbs | Other files:  
• English letter revised_updated_02_12_2018  
• O365 Groups – QRG  
• Preparing a winning self-study1  
• Program review roster  
• UPRC Workshops Feb 2018 |
Appendix 3: Issues of Concern in Academic Program Review at CSUB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPRC Recommendations/Issues of Concern</th>
<th>AY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 theWSCUC 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
6. Required program data elements for program review (Undergraduate):

Dominguez Hills
1. https://www.csudh.edu/uepa/program-review/
2. Every 6 years
3. Available on the website:
   a. Goals of academic program review
b. Program Review Schedule

c. Program Review Guide

d. Program Review Panel Charge

e. Program Review Panel Roster

f. Program Review Panel Meeting Minutes (2016-17)
g. Past Program Review Summary Agreements

East Bay

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

5. Academic Program Review Procedures: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1IF7nNAybb3LzAnGFnn0myCg7htGt2PYI/view

6. CAPR Committee Policies & Procedures (CAPR Charge): https://docs.google.com/document/d/16t5vMmW98kjb8g0askhM4m_QLe9CUMLfj_PTLXND-DeU/edit

Fresno

1. University Committee Review: https://www.fresnostate.edu/academics/curriculum/prog-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)


**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
            2. Program Review Self-study Handbook:
               [http://www.calstatela.edu/sites/default/files/groups/WSCUC%20Accreditation%20Program%20Review%20and%20Assessment/Exhibits/6.7_program_review_handbook.pdf](http://www.calstatela.edu/sites/default/files/groups/WSCUC%20Accreditation%20Program%20Review%20and%20Assessment/Exhibits/6.7_program_review_handbook.pdf)
            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](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/](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](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/](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_AP_R_cycle.pdf

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

A. Interview Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>Interviewee(s)</th>
<th>Time of Zoom Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>Dr. Maureen Scharberg: Associate Provost for Academic Resources &amp; Planning</td>
<td>7/15/2020 9am-10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Dr. Bernadette Muscat: Undergraduate Program Review Officer; Interim Dean,</td>
<td>7/9/2020 9am-10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Program Review Officer; Dean, Division of Research and Graduate</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</td>
<td>7/8/2020 2pm-3pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erin Littlepage: Student Success and Community Partnerships Specialist;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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/16t5vMmW98kb8g0AshkhM4m_QLe9CUMLi_PTLXND-DeU/edit
   b. Academic Program Review Procedures: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1IF7nNAyb3LzAnGFnn0myCg7htGt2PYI/view

2. Fresno

3. Long Beach
   a. Comprehensive

4. Los Angeles

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

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

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

C. Interview Questions: General Questions

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues of Concern in Program Review</th>
<th>Recommended Changes</th>
<th>Responsible Constituencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance of the Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of assessing student learning outcomes</td>
<td>Have regular training workshops on assessment</td>
<td>Faculty, Assessment Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of UPRC</td>
<td>Select UPRC members as soon as possible</td>
<td>Faculty, Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing and reaffirming Program Review Template</td>
<td>Finalize and approve program review template</td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing and reaffirming MOUAP Template</td>
<td>Finalize and approve MOUAP template</td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring programs have sufficient notice for preparing their Self-Study and Program Plan</td>
<td>Develop and maintain a realistic program review timeline, and affirm adherence to it</td>
<td>UPRC; Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></td>
<td></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 deans 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>UPRC, Academic Programs</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!
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 SOClS 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 SOClS in accordance with (something is missing here) during the fall semester, prior to the beginning of the evaluation process for the first established departmental policy and for a minimum of two classes for each year taught since their last periodic evaluation. Temporary faculty in Group 1 shall be reviewed during the Spring PEF cycle. Temporary faculty in Group 3 or 4 shall be reviewed yearly during the Spring RTP cycle. (Revised 06-06-17)

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

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

Thanks,
Aaron

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

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

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


Thanks,
Bruce
Hi Aaron,

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

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

Melissa

---

Hi, Melissa.

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

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

Beth, would you please amend the item on the agenda to say “FYS Instructors and GECCo
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/
Tyler M. Ensor, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Psychology
I am interested in being appointed to the Campus Climate Committee. I am blind, so have first-hand 
experience navigating academia as a person with a disability. This obviously does not give me direct 
insight into what people from other marginalized communities experience, but it gives me an 
appreciation of the importance of equity, inclusion, and diversity.

Apart from my personal experiences, I also have a statistics background, which could be helpful in 
monitoring the success of any plans we implement. I am in the Department of Psychology but was hired 
to teach statistics and research methods.

This is only my second year at CSUB, and this is consequently my first time applying for a position like 
this. Please let me know if you need any additional information from me.

All the best,
Tyler

Patrick O’Neill, M.A.
Lecturer, Anthropology
My statement:
1.) I currently serve on the Academic Affairs Committee, GECCo, The CSUB Sustainability Committee, 
and the Native American Initiative Committee.
2.) I served previously on The Academic Affairs Committee, the Athletics advising committee, the 
University Council, and as Chair of the CFA Political Actions Committee.
3.) I have served as a board member of the California Rock art Association.
4.) I am currently a founding member of the CSU Council of Archaeologists.

I am versed in procedures and regulations, and willing to speak up. I believe in shared governance and 
faculty solidarity, rather than complacency or elitism.
Thanks,
Patrick
Adriana Cervantes-González, Ed.D. | Lecturer
Department of Teacher Education

I am a full-time lecturer in the Department of Teacher Education with the School of Social Sciences and Education and am interested in serving on the campus climate committee for a two-year term, December 2020 to December 2022. I am pleased that I have the support of my department chair in this endeavor and have experience working with various stakeholders in the development of equity action plans and know that conversations centered around diversity, equity and inclusion are often charged with deep emotion. This is so because this work involves self-examination, analysis of practice and investigation of organizational practices. I recognize that it is the deep emotions that institutions must work through to better understand how persons within the institution can be change agents when equipped as part of the larger solution when confronting and overcoming barriers that can ameliorate efforts for overall student success, which ultimately impact the campus climate in meaningful ways.

In 2018 I participated in a training that resulted in my certification with the Center for Culturally Proficient Educators. Prior to that, while on the board of directors of the non-profit organization, The Center for Leadership, Equity, and Research - I spearheaded the efforts in a university wide professional development series while at Fresno State for the Department of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management in 2017. These efforts included personnel at various organizational levels (i.e. students, faculty, staff). At this professional development series, I also presented a session titled: SHIft Happens When Challenging Deficit Thinking, Creating a New Narrative - a session that explored the significance of understanding deficit ideologies and its impact on students. When institutions participate from deficit-oriented ideologies, oftentimes it is students that are blamed for the challenges they encounter while navigating our educational institutions. Relying on the strengths of our educational institutions and the persons that make up the campus, one can build capacity for true organizational change from within and this is an effort I am well suited for and qualified to serve in.

I look forward to your confirmation of my interest to serve in this capacity and look forward to next steps if considered for this possibility.

Kind Regards,
- Adriana

Jackie Kegley, Ph.D
Professor Philosophy and Religious Studies

I was involved in Campus Climate Surveys for our campus in the past and I have served on a Campus Climate Committee both here and at the statewide level. I also teach the Junior Diversity course and deal with issues of diversity and inclusion. I am also trained in ethics.

Jackie
Kris Grappendorf  
Lecturer, Kinesiology

I would like to be considered for the Campus Climate Survey. Here are a few reasons why I feel I am qualified:

- 23 years as a lecturer at CSUB working directly with thousands of students from diverse backgrounds.
- Member of the LGBTQ+ community
- Co-chair of the LGBTQ+ faculty staff affinity group since its beginning.
- Co-chair of the LGBTQ+ Network student organization
- Member of the campus team spring 2021 that participated in the CSU Certificate Program in Student Success Analytics that included several webinars on diversity related issues for engaging students and analysis of campus equity gaps.

Thank you.
Kris

R. Aaron Wisman  
Assistant Professor, Advanced Education Studies

See attached letter.
November 24, 2020

To the Members of the Selection Committee for the Campus Climate Committee:

I am writing to express my interest in serving on the Campus Climate Committee (CCC) at California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) and to articulate how my background may be relevant to the stated objectives of the CCC. I am a third-year assistant professor in the Department of Advanced Educational Studies in the School of Social Sciences and Education (SSE). I teach in the Educational Administration (PK-12) program as well as in the Doctoral Program for Educational Leadership (DPEL). My doctoral training is in Educational Leadership and Organizational Development (PK-12).

My interest in serving on the committee is driven by my axiological foundations grounded in equity and inclusion. I believe diversity is a strength and that the differences of each are assets of the whole. I also believe that much can be done within educational organizations and institutions to mitigate inequities, disparities in outcomes between historically marginalized groups and their peers, and foster a climate of safety, belonging, and well-being.

Since I first stepped foot on campus during an interview in the Fall of 2017, I have been excited about working at CSUB because there is a sense of pride among stakeholders in our status as a Hispanic serving institution. I take great pride in knowing that CSUB is widely recognized as an institution that can affect one’s social mobility, especially for the historically disenfranchised. I was further moved earlier this year, during University Day, when faculty representatives led the University in modeling courageous conversations about race and racism at CSUB. To me, this indicated that CSUB is indeed living up to its mantra of being “On the Rise.” I interpret the Rise as ensuring equitable educational opportunities for all students. While there is much work to be done, I am excited about our future.

My passion for equity and inclusion can be seen in my emerging scholarly expertise in diversity and equity in K-12 educative contexts. While I do not claim to have any expertise in the area of higher educational leadership, I am confident that the expertise I have developed may contribute to the work of the CCC. I also take great pride in my teaching to prepare future educational leaders (both in the Educational Administration program and in the DPEL program) to identify, confront, and supplant institutional factors that perpetuate a status quo of white power and dominance and replace those structures with anti-racist policies and practices. I teach courses that center community engagement, culturally competent leadership, and research in education. I believe the expertise I am developing through my teaching speak directly to the objectives of the CCC.

In addition to my training in the field of educational leadership, I also bring some practical expertise from my work in K-12 education; in particular, my work with educational leaders, teachers, families,
and students in turning around persistently low achieving schools and districts in my role with the Kentucky Department of Education prior to entering the professoriate. In that role, I gained experience in evaluating educational organizations (using the AdvancED Standards and Indicators), including aspects of climate and culture, and made recommendations for organizational change to affect disparities in educational outcomes. I believe this expertise is directly transferable to the stated objectives of the CCC.

In addition, I have been facilitating the CSUB Educator Preparation Program’s (a unit within the SSE) Equity and Justice Work Group established in the Fall of 2019. The Equity and Justice Work Group facilitates collaborative self-study of faculty who prepare educators and educational leaders about practices related to issues of equity and social justice. Through facilitating this work, I have gained some expertise in leading and participating in what Singleton (2015) calls, courageous conversations about race among my colleagues at the University.

I am excited about this opportunity to share in the leadership of the University in light of the aims of the CCC. In addition, my recent professional learning in the Faculty Leadership Academy (2020-2021 cohort) has furthered my interest in opportunities to use my expertise in equity and justice to serve the university for continuous improvement toward those ends. I was moved by the recent learning facilitated by our University’s Chief Diversity Officer and Director of Equity, Inclusion, and Compliance.

I have included my current vita as an attachment to this letter of interest in hopes that the committee will consider these and other strengths and assets my teaching, leadership, scholarship, and service will offer to the CCC. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

R. Aaron Wisman, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor
Advanced Educational Studies
California State University, Bakersfield
rwisman@csub.edu
DATE: 1 December 2020

TO: Aaron Hegde, Chair, Academic Senate

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

FROM: Isabel Sumaya, University Research Ethics Review Coordinator

SUBJECT: Recommendation for Re-Appointment

Following policy for re-appointment of its members and based on the recommendation of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) this memo is to recommend the re-appointment of Chris Livingston, CSUB Archival Librarian, to continue to serve as a Non-Scientific Member on the board. Chris will complete a 3-year term on January 30, 2021. His re-appointment is for another three-year term beginning 31 January 2021 concluding 30 January 2024. If the Academic Senate is in agreement with the re-appointment, please forward his nomination to the Academic Provost with an expression of your support. Upon agreement of the recommendation, please let me know when the Academic Senate has advised the Provost’s Office. Thank you.

Below is Chris’ email: clivingston@csub.edu
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

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

Hi Aaron,

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

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

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

Thanks,

Andreas

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

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

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

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

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

Responsibilities of the General Education Curriculum Committee

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

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

Composition of the General Education Curriculum Committee

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

Selection of the GE Faculty Director

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

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

Guidelines and Procedures for GE Certification of Courses

The following guidelines shall govern GE course submissions:

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

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

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

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

Management of Themes

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

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

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

APPENDIX—Proposed Procedures
Existing Curricular Policies
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.
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
MEMORANDUM

Date: November 30, 2020

To: Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

From: Alicia E. Rodriquez, Director, Interdisciplinary Studies Program and Professor of History

Subject: Proposal for moratorium on the MA in Interdisciplinary Studies

The Interdisciplinary Studies Program proposes that its MA degree program be placed on moratorium until it can be revised and reinstated in a form that better serves students. In accordance with guidelines in the Academic Senate document approved on May 24, 2012, “CSU Bakersfield Policy on Academic Program Moratorium and Discontinuance,” on Monday, November 23, 2020, on my behalf, the Office of Academic Programs circulated a proposal to place the program on moratorium to the campus community. I requested that any comments on the proposal be sent Dr. Richard Gearhart, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee. Dr. Gearhart, however, has pointed out to me that the comments and the proposal should be received and reviewed by the Executive Committee first. I apologize for the error. I trust that Dr. Gearhart will forward any comments he receives to you. The two-week comment period closes on December 7, 2020, two weeks from the date the proposal was circulated. Below is the rationale for placing the MA in INST on moratorium, and the timeline for phasing it out and reinstating it.

Rationale for placing the MA in Interdisciplinary Studies on moratorium:

The Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies degree program, which the Academic Senate approved in Fall 1999 and went into effect in Fall 2000, represents an opportunity by which students with intellectual interests that do not easily fit into one discipline can earn an MA. In theory, it provides students with the chance to utilize the methods and approaches of more than one discipline to address a research question and carry out a creative and innovative culminating project that is interdisciplinary in nature. Unfortunately, the reality is that the Interdisciplinary MA program has not served students well. Currently, a student who wishes to pursue an INST MA must find a faculty advisor in a “host” program – a program that currently offers an MA degree – and develop a committee and program of study with the host discipline’s advisor and
committee members in other programs. The committee chair must come from a department that offers an MA; the other committee members may be in programs that do not offer an MA. Many students who choose the INST MA are doing so because the program in which they received undergraduate training, and in which they would ideally like to pursue graduate work, does not offer an MA at CSU Bakersfield. In other words, students who choose the INST MA pathway are doing so simply to earn a master’s level degree, not because they want a master’s degree that combines graduate work from an existing program at CSUB with post-baccalaureate work from another discipline. Unfortunately, this means that the student’s degree plan will often be ill-suited for the student’s goals. Furthermore, students enrolling in graduate-level courses in which they do not have sufficient knowledge and methodological foundations may find that the host discipline courses are above what they can manage, given the limits of their discipline-specific training. Regardless of the reasons, students are not achieving success in the INST MA.

A study of 56 students who last enrolled as INST MA students between 2008 to Spring 2020 showed that among those, only 8 (14.2%) successfully completed the program. Given the program’s low student success rate, I initiated the formal process of placing the INST MA on moratorium by requesting that the Council of Graduate Directors vote to place the program on moratorium until the program can be studied, revised, and reinstated in a new form that allows it to better serve students. The Council voted in favor of moratorium on February 24, 2020.

**Timeline for phasing out the MA in Interdisciplinary Studies:**

No new students applied to the INST MA in Spring 2020 or Fall 2020, and after the moratorium is approved, no students will be allowed to apply for admittance into the program. As there are currently no students enrolled in the program, none will be affected.

**Timeline for reactivation:**

The moratorium is expected to be temporary. To reactivate the program and develop a robust program that can help students achieve success, a number of steps need to be taken. In academic year, 2021-2022, representatives of programs that offer an MA will be invited to participate in discussions on how to best revise the INST MA. In the following academic year, 2022-2023, stakeholders will work on rebuilding the INST MA curriculum. The revised program will undergo the approval process in 2023 and is expected to be reinstated in Fall 2024.