1
2

3   **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW**
4
5   18-19 CAPR 26
6   Thursday, April 18th , 2019
7

TO: The Academic Senate

FROM: The Committee on Academic Planning Review (CAPR)

SUBJECT: 18-19 CAPR 26: Revisions to CAPR Annual Report and Five-year Program
                  Review Procedures

PURPOSE: For action by the Academic Senate

**ACTION   Update the CAPR annual report and 5 year review documents integrating
REQUESTED:**   semester conversion, GE, and ILO policies that have been adopted by
                  Academic Senate.

8
9
10   **BACKGROUND:**
11   During the academic year 2018-19, CAPR members and Dean of Academic Programs
12   and Service, Maureen Scharberg (along with Dr. Kevin Brown and Julie Stein) began to
13   reorganize the 17-18 CAPR 5 Academic Program Review Procedures. This task was
14   begun to streamline and clarify the procedures for these reviews. The current document
15   contains a mixture of explanations for the annual reports and five-year reviews, lack of
16   clear deadlines for annual reports, and some disconnect between CAPR liaison guidelines
17   and what report authors are provided. The revised document contains three sections: An
18   Overview, Annual Academic Program Reviews and Five-Year Academic Program
19   Reviews. The appendices in each of these sections provide checklists, templates and
20   clear timelines for the completion of each.
21
22   In order to give current programs the opportunity to pilot this new format, CAPR would
23   like to provide these new templates to all programs by the end of the Spring 2019
24   semester. It is the understanding of CAPR that further revisions may be necessary during
25   the 2019-2020 academic year. We recommend that these documents be reviewed and
26   resubmitted again in the Spring of 2020 with further recommended clarity.
27
28   CAPR approved this process with a unanimous vote at its meeting on April 18th, 2019.

CAPR Program Review Procedures – Table of Contents

<u>APPENDICES</u>

APPENDIX A: Submission Information for Five-Year Academic Program Reviews

APPENDIX B: CAPR Guidelines for 5-Year Annual Program Review

APPENDIX C: External Reviewer's Guidelines and Responsibilities
Link to request for External Reviewer
http://www.csueastbay.edu/faculty/senate/five-year-review.html

APPENDIX D: CAPR Template for **Summary of** Five-Year Annual Program Review
(approved November 2018)

OVERVIEW OF ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT AND 5-YEAR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

I. INTRODUCTION

The assessment and planning noted in the review process that is presented in a combination of both Annual Program Reports and Five (5) Year Academic Review Reports, are an integral part of the resource allocation process at the university. Annual Program Reports are a vital part of requests for additional resources, including tenure-track hires. Five Year Academic Reviews provide an opportunity for long-term planning for programs.

The purpose of academic program review at CSUEB relates to three primary functions:

A. **Accountability:** Academic program review is one way to ensure to students, the Board of Trustees, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), and the public it serves that CSUEB is providing quality programs;

B. **Program Improvement**: The academic program review process provides a continuing cycle for program faculty, staff, and administrators to receive timely information and a forum for providing feedback, ensuring an institutional commitment for ongoing programmatic improvements; and

C. **Program and Resource Alignment**: Academic program review provides the means to ensure that CSUEB will offer an appropriate array of academic programs and that the institutional resources will be effectively aligned with its academic programs.

Program review is extremely important for development of informed decisions about program, faculty and student needs, resource allocation, and management. A successful program review depends upon faculty willingness to engage in an intensive and comprehensive self-study and program plan using both qualitative and quantitative data. It provides an opportunity for all program members to share opinions and to discuss ideas. Professional discourse among colleagues about the educational needs of students, the program and society at-large is essential.

The review of academic programs will play a significant role in determining tenure- track faculty allocations and other resources. Guided by each college's planning framework, program reviews lay out multi-year plans that advance the university mission. It is incumbent upon the Colleges to use Program Review as an instrument of planning from which emerge criteria for resource allocation, including new tenure-track faculty hires.

The Board of Trustees of the CSU system requires that all academic programs be reviewed approximately every five years. The goals of this process are self-evaluation and curricular revitalization to allow each program to assess and to plan for the challenges of the future.

II. ROLES OF DEPARTMENTS, PROGRAMS, and COLLEGES

Departments and Programs will prepare the Annual Reports and Academic Program Reviews **by the required deadlines.** Copies of the Annual Program Reports, and the 5-Year Academic Program Review, will be submitted to the appropriate College Dean for review and approval and then electronically to the Senate Office. Since these reports include accountability measures and quality improvement provisions, these reports inform the decision-making procedures for the Programs, Departments, and Colleges, particularly with regard to resource allocation decisions, including tenure-track allocations (see below). College Deans, Department Chairs, and Program Directors will use these materials to work together to reach a consensus about the future direction of the program and College as well as for making decisions for immediate needs.

III.   ROLES OF SHARED GOVERNANCE AND UNIVERSITY

Annual Program Reports: _____

Annual Program Reports are submitted yearly in the Fall semester (Oct. 1) and should contribute to the contents of the 5-year Academic Review.

5-Year Academic Review Reports:

As part of its 5-Year Program Review Report to the Senate, CAPR will submit a **summary** report including its recommendations **regarding the program's continuation**., and the summary provided in the Program's Five-Year Review Self-Study

Following Senate approval of CAPR's recommendations and memo, the Provost will review the summary and meet with members of the department under review and the CAPR chair at a time mutually agreeable during the Spring term to devise a clear 5-year plan moving forward. The Provost will then create a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Department and return that MOU to the Senate as an information item as soon as possible (completion of a MOU may require extension into the following Fall semester given scheduling timelines).

CAPR has determined that, at CSUEB, five-year academic program review will be required for all baccalaureate, master's and doctoral degree programs, and shall include curricular and academic support programs such as General Education, Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), other graduation requirements (e.g., Overlay requirements, second English composition), Athletics, and University wide resources such as the Library and computing services. Generally, reviews of graduate programs will be scheduled at the same time as the review of the undergraduate program(s) within the same discipline. However, graduate programs are expected to provide specific program data and analysis on all elements where possible. The Five-Year Academic Program Review Schedule will be updated annually and posted on the Academic Senate website. In addition, CAPR will provide support to academic programs undergoing five-year review. This will include the provision of a workshop or workshops on the requirements, timelines, statistical data, and any other element of the program review process that is needed or requested. Each program

will be assigned a liaison from CAPR, one of whose responsibilities is to assist the program with its process.

IV.   ROLES OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN THE TENURE-TRACK ALLOCATION PROCESS

The following principles and recommendations in how to meet those principles are provided here. These principles emphasize the importance of faculty governance and peer review in the process of academic program review.

- GUIDING PRINCIPLE: Faculty participation in Tenure-Track allocation is a guiding principle of the University. The Five-Year Academic Program Reviews and Annual Program Reports should play a significant role in determining tenure-track faculty allocations.

    Recommendations on how to achieve this:

- Departments and colleges requesting tenure-track positions should explain, where appropriate, how the requested position is necessary for the unit to meet its goals and carry out its plans as described in its most recent Five-Year Review and ensuing Annual Reports. Connections between the Program's mission and the University's Mission and Values statement should be emphasized.

PRINCIPLE 1: New faculty hiring must take into consideration the University's enrollment growth objectives.

- Recommendations on how to achieve this:

- Departments and colleges requesting new faculty positions should indicate relevant enrollment figures and/or meaningful enrollment projections.

- The President should give the closest attention to opportunities for sustained and new student enrollment for the University as a whole.

- PRINCIPLE 2: University-wide and department plans for faculty hiring must be formulated in accordance with the University's Mission, Vision, and Values statements.

    Recommendations on how to achieve this:

- Departments, colleges and the Library requesting tenure-track positions should show how the requested position and the program to which it is attached can help the University meet its mission, vision and values.

- The President should give priority to those faculty hiring requests that present the best

opportunities to advance the University's mission, make the most effective use of resources, and support the principles of this guide. The President should give favorable attention to requests that offer to combine resources.

The President should give serious consideration to requests that show significant promise of helping Departments meet their missions.

PRINCIPLE 3: While the University relies on both regular (tenure-track) faculty and lecturers, if CSUEB is to remain a quality institution and attract new students to its undergraduate and graduate programs it must rely principally on regular faculty and continue to work to achieve the goal of 75% tenure-track faculty. The University also must insure that its general education program meets the needs of students and is well staffed by qualified, mainly regular tenure-track faculty.

Recommendations on how to achieve this:

Departments and colleges seeking tenure-track hires should show how such hires will improve the department's quality and advance the department's and the University's goals and obligations in general education. Departments in the arts and sciences should, in general and where appropriate, seek faculty who are capable of teaching both in major programs and in general education.

The President/Provost should make every reasonable effort to replace and, when possible, exceed the number of regular faculty who are separating from the University. The President should give serious and careful consideration to requests for tenure-track positions that make a strong case for replacing lecturers, especially from departments in which use of lecturers is inconsistent with the appropriate uses presented above.

PRINCIPLE 4: The University must offer a wide variety of programs balancing professional preparation and new possibilities with education in the arts and sciences.

Recommendations on how to achieve this:

Departments and colleges requesting new tenure-track hires should explain, where appropriate, how such hiring will help to maintain the University's broad array of programs and will reflect enrollment patterns, trends, and projections.

The President should, in making decisions about new tenure-track hiring authorizations, take into account the University's balance of professional and arts and sciences offerings to current and future students. The President/Provost should also examine enrollment patterns, trends, and projections relevant to new tenure-track position requests.

When requesting new tenure-track hires, departments and colleges should consider new

programmatic possibilities that will harness existing strengths and/or identify new directions. Cooperation among departments and colleges should be encouraged.

The President/Provost should give serious consideration to proposals for new faculty hiring involving new programmatic possibilities that offer high promise to attract new students, add to the University's prestige, and attract new or additional sources of external funding.

PRINCIPLE 5: Assessment plans and evaluation processes are an expected part of Academic Program Review.

Recommendations on how to achieve this:

Departments and colleges requesting new tenure-track hires should explain, using departmental assessment data, how such hiring is supported by assessment data.

The President/Provost should, in making decisions about new tenure-track hiring authorizations, take into account departmental assessment data and data-driven plans for refining curriculum for the major.

PRINCIPLE 6: The University must seek to balance hiring of faculty with the clear understanding that attracting new students and maintaining a reputation for quality ultimately helps the entire institution.

Recommendations on how to achieve this:

In developing their academic and faculty hiring plans, colleges and departments must consider the needs of high-growth and/or prestige programs, as well as the overall needs of undergraduate and graduate education.

The President should give serious consideration to requests for tenure-track hiring that offer high promise for enrollment growth and/or add to or maintain the University's prestige.

PRINCIPLE 7: Hiring decisions must, in part, be based on the quality of department and college plans and on the capacity of the program to absorb and use new faculty.

Recommendations on how to achieve this:

Departments, colleges and the Library requesting new tenure-track positions should explain the role to be played by the prospective faculty member and offer assurances that the new faculty member will receive appropriate and adequate mentoring and guidance.

In evaluating departmental requests for new faculty hires, the President should take into account the department's (or equivalent hiring unit's) ability to conduct a search, and its capacity to absorb and use new faculty.

PRINCIPLE 8: Although certainly there will be exceptions, hiring that offers the best opportunity to improve the education our students receive is of the greatest importance.

To be sure, faculty who come to CSUEB should be accomplished and active scholars and/or engaged in significant practical or creative activity related to their disciplines. And they should also be willing to serve the campus and the community. But, first and foremost, they should be teachers.

Recommendations on how to achieve this:

Departments requesting new tenure-track faculty hires indicate that they will seek faculty who are capable, willing, and eager to teach CSUEB students.

The President /Provost should give serious consideration to requests for new faculty who will strengthen the University's capacity to educate our students, especially in writing, mathematical, critical thinking and information literacy skill.

II. ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT PROCEDURES

A. Introduction to the Annual Program Report

An overview of the Annual Program Report and its relationship to the Five-Year Academic Program Review for Programs can be found **in the previous section.**

The Annual Program Report **(3-5 pages total**) provides the basis for planning consultation between the program and appropriate administrators, to present facts and record the outcome(s) of processes for reference in the future. The Annual Program Report is also the basis for any new resources, including tenure-track hires, that a program may request. The Annual Program Report should provide evidence of the program's work completed during the previous annual assessment cycle. Each program is expected to report on the full assessment cycle for one or more program learning outcomes in each annual report. **This report is due by Oct. 1ˢᵗ of the reporting year.**

The assessment cycle, which includes review and alignment of PLOs to the program curriculum (i.e., curriculum mapping), a review of the results of closing the loop from the previous assessment cycle, assessment planning, direct and indirect assessment, actions taken to close-the-loop, and reporting, will be completed by all programs every year. **CAPR and programs will coordinate PLO and relevant ILO, GE, and Overlay assessment activities and reporting with the Educational Effectiveness Council. Academic Programs and Services (APS) will provide CAPR with relevant assessment data appropriate to the ILO being assessed for distribution to the colleges.** In addition **to academic assessment material, data could be included from the Bay Advisor** , the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the Student Center for Academic Achievement (SCAA), or other University sources. data.

The Annual Program Report provides data for the Five-Year Review, and is especially usefu**l in validating the progress on CAPR recommendations, tracking the tenure-track requests and the results of those requests, and ensuring** continuity and full disclosure between the outgoing/incoming department chairs.

Viewed as progress on the department or program's Five-Year Plan, departments/programs will file the Annual Program Report in the Senate Office. These Annual Program Reports will become part of the Five-Year Academic Program Review for both externally accredited programs and non-externally accredited programs. The Annual Program Report is a valuable mechanism to hold departments and the administration jointly accountable for academic program quality and provides departments with the following benefits:

● Documentation of actions toward fulfilling their last five-year plan.

● Documentation of administrative commitments made during the last program review and evidence or explanation of follow through. **This** will allow the Senate Chair to assist the department in rectifying any lack of follow through.

● Documentation of progress made toward CAPR recommendations or modifications of the program as an update to the college Dean, the CAPR Chair and the Senate.

● An annual cycle of program assessment provides evidence of ongoing analysis of program learning outcomes, **other relevant ILO, GE, and Overlay outcomes,** and documentation of program improvements.

● For incoming Department Chairs, the annual reports will provide documentation which will get them up to speed more quickly on issues such as CAPR's response to the department's plans, the department's progress toward achieving the goals outlined in the plan, the administration's support for the department, recent changes in curriculum, and in the department's enrollment, faculty, SFR and FTES data.

● The Five Year Program Review will be much easier to accomplish with several Annual Reports to refer to. Chairs only need to add the planning piece and arguments for additional support being **requested. The** basic data required for CAPR reports will already be in place.

● The Annual Program Reports will be valuable to the external reviewers.

● **The** Annual Program Reports will allow departments to spot increases or decreases in enrollments, majors, minors, etc., earlier, allowing the department to adjust more quickly to changes in demands on the department. **If a program has a parallel self-support program (online or face-to-face, offered through University Extension), data to document enrollment patterns in both state-side and self-support must be included in the report (i.e. FTEs, budgetary balances) and justify increased enrollments in self-support programs without detriment to state-side program enrollments.**

● The Annual Report will also serve as the tenure-track hiring request document for the Academic Year in which it is filed, e.g., the Annual Report filed in Fall 2018 is the tenure-track hiring request for searches conducted in AY 19 – 20. Again, where relevant, reference to self-support versus state-side programs in faculty and staff loads is imperative.
.
1.   Contents for the Annual Program Report
 Annual Reports shall consist of the following parts, described in detail below:

a.   A brief self -study (**suggested length of 1-2 pages)**
b.   A summary of assessment results and any planned academic and non-academic improvements (**suggested length of 1-2 pages)**
c.   Discussion of program data and resource request **(suggested length of 2 pages)**

a. Self-study: A self-study reports on progress with departmental planning, review, assessment processes, and programmatic needs.

Each program will produce a brief Annual Report describing progress toward its goals, problems reaching its goals, revision of goals, and initiatives. It will also include any changes related to Associate Degree for Transfer (SB1440, The STAR Act) if applicable. This document will indicate how the results of the program's assessment efforts support its conclusions and **will** also record significant events which have occurred or are imminent, such as changes to resources, retirements, new hires, curricular changes, honors received, etc. This self-study should include a reflection on the assessment data and program statistics and any action to be taken to make improvements. This report will be developed during the Fall term by the Program Unit, discussed with appropriate administrators, and a copy will be kept on file in the Senate Office. Together with the most recent program review, these reports form part of the basis for

short-term planning consultations between the Program Unit and appropriate administrators. The collection of Annual Program Reports since the last program review will assist CAPR and the program in writing and reviewing the next program review document.

b. Summary of Assessment Results: A summary of assessment results.

All programs must assess progress toward their program goals, program learning outcomes (PLOs), **and relevant ILO, GE, and Overlay outcomes** in a way that provides evidence of the success of current efforts and/or the need for change. While the particular means of assessment must be tailored to the specific program, this **section** should contain a reflection upon progress made and changes with respect to the PLO and other relevant assessment plans that were reported in the five-year review self-study as detailed in this document.

Rather than assess all the PLOs when the five-year review self-study is prepared, programs should stagger their assessment over the five years between reviews. This allows programs to assess one or more outcomes each year and report on them in this Annual Program Report to make the assessment, annual review, and five-year review processes more manageable. **ILO,GE, and Overlay assessment activities should follow the schedules given in the ILO Long-Term Assessment and General Education Long-Term Assessment Plans.**

The Annual Program Review assessment section includes the following information:
- The results of closing the loop from the previous assessment cycle
- Which program learning outcome was assessed
- Which course(s) were assessed
- Which assessment methods/ instrument(s) were used to measure this PLO
- Which populations were sampled to assess this PLO
- What assessment results were obtained, highlighting important findings from the data collected
- How the assessment results were (or will be) used to make curricular or other changes (e.g., changes in course pedagogy course sequence, student advising, etc., as well as any revisions to the assessment process). **If the outcome assessed was aligned to an ILO, GE, or Overlay outcome, include a summary of the data provided or collected along with a discussion of how the findings were or will be used to make curricular or other changes.**

Please use the template in the appendix for your report.

c. Discussion of Program Data and Resource Request.

Each program should provide a one page discussion of the program data available through the University Dashboard. CAPR will provide support in who to contact and possible data to access for the report. This discussion should include an analysis of trends and areas of concern. Programs should also include in this discussion requests for additional resources including space and tenure-track hires. ~~Resource requests must be supported by reference to CAPR data only.~~ Requests for tenure-track hires should indicate the area and rank that the program is requesting to hire. If a program is not requesting resources in that year, indicate that no resources are requested. Data from self-support programs should be included in this discussion.

B.   Timeline for the Annual Program Report (approved by CAPR February 21ˢᵗ,

Given the timeline for the Annual Program Report (see Appendix), the Program Chair/Director will submit the 3-5-page Annual Report to the College Dean, including assessment data through the Spring semester of the previous academic year. These reports will reflect the plans and actions which form much of the basis for administrative allocation of resources to the program. At the same time, a copy of the Annual Program Report will also be submitted electronically to the Dean of Academic Programs & Services, and the Senate Office Coordinator, and will be available to CAPR as additional information during the Program's Five-Year Review Process.

CAPR will contact programs immediately after the first CAPR meeting after the fourth week of the Fall term if an annual report was not submitted or is incomplete. Programs will have one week to correct any defects in submissions. A list of programs with no submission or incomplete submissions will be forwarded to Academic Affairs and may be excluded from tenure-track hiring in that cycle.

Note: if a program is submitting a 5-year Academic Program Review during the following Spring, then a truncated Annual Program Report with only requests for resources and tenure track hires is required with supportive data and rationale for requests. The 5-year Academic Program Review for the following Spring will include the Annual Report data along with full discussion of assessments.

TIMELINE:

1. **Annual Program Reviews are due to CAPR by October 1st of the Fall semester*.**
2. **Preliminary recommendations from CAPR are due to Provost by November 1st of the Fall semester.**
3. **Provost gives Deans his recommendations by December 1st of the Fall semester.**
4. **Deans provide Provost with their recommendations by February 1st of the subsequent Spring semester.**
5. **Provost allocates tenure-track positions by February 28th of the subsequent Spring semester.**

*NOTE: Again, if a program is submitting a 5-year Academic Program Review during the following Spring, then a truncated Annual Program Report with only requests for resources and tenure track hires is required with supportive data and rationale for requests. The 5-year Academic Program Review for the following Spring will include the Annual Report data along with full discussion of assessments.

Appendix A: TEMPLATE FOR ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT REVIEW (See preceding document for detailed descriptions for each section).
History:
08-09 CAPR 23 (revised)
18-19 CAPR XX (revised)

College	
Department	
Program	
Reporting for Academic Year	
Last 5-Year Review	
Next 5-Year Review	
Department Chair	
Author of Review	
Date Submitted	

I. **<u>SELF-STUDY</u>** *(suggested length of 1-2 pages)*

A. **Five-Year Review Planning Goals**
Present your planning goals from your last 5-year plan.

B. **Progress Toward Five-Year Review Planning Goals**
Report on your progress toward achievement of the 5-Year Plan. Include discussion of problems reaching each goal, revised goals, and any new initiatives taken with respect to each goal.

C. Program Changes and Needs
Report on changes and emerging needs not already discussed above. Include any changes related to SB1440, significant events which have occurred or are imminent, program demand projections, notable changes in resources, retirements/new hires, curricular changes, honors received, etc., and their implications for attaining program goals. Organize your discussion using the following subheadings.
Overview:
Curriculum:
Students:
Faculty:
Staff:
Resources: *(facilities, space, equipment, etc.)*
Assessment:
Other: *(e.g., major program modifications)*

II. **<u>SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT</u>** *(suggested length of 1-2 pages)*

A. **Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)**
List all your PLO in this box. ***Indicate for each PLO its alignment with one or more institutional learning outcomes (ILO). For example: "PLO 1. Apply advanced computer science theory to computation problems (ILO 2 & 6)."***

B. **Program Learning Outcome(S) Assessed**

  List the PLO(s) assessed. Provide a brief background on your program's history of assessing the PLO(s) (e.g., annually, first time, part of other assessments, etc.)

C. **Summary of Assessment Process**

  Summarize your assessment process briefly using the following sub-headings.
    Instrument(s): *(include if new or old instrument, how developed, description of content)*
    Sampling Procedure:
    Sample Characteristics:
    Data Collection: *(include when, who, and how collected)*
    Data Analysis:

D. **Summary of Assessment Results**

  Summarize your assessment results briefly using the following sub-headings.

    Main Findings:
    Recommendations for Program Improvement: *(changes in course content, course sequence, student advising)*
    Next Step(s) for Closing the Loop: *(recommendations to address findings, how & when)*
    Other Reflections:

E. **Assessment Plans for Next Year**

  Summarize your assessment plans for the next year, including the PLO(s) you plan to assess, any revisions to the program assessment plan presented in your last five-year plan self-study, and any other relevant information.

III. **<u>DISCUSSION OF PROGRAM DATA & RESOURCE REQUESTS</u> (suggested length of 2 pages)**

  Each program should provide a one-page discussion of the program data available through University Dashboard. This discussion should include an analysis of trends and areas of concern. Programs should also include in this discussion requests for additional resources including space and tenure-track hires. Resource requests must be supported by reference to University Dashboard data. Requests for tenure-track hires should indicate the area and rank that the program is requesting to hire. If a program is not requesting resources in that year, indicate that no resources are requested.

A. **Discussion of Trends & Reflections**
    Notable Trends:
    Summarize and discuss any notable trends occurring in your program over the past 3-5 years based on program statistics (1-2 paragraphs). You may include 1-2 pages of supplemental information as appendices to this report (e.g., graphs and tables).
    Reflections on Trends and Program Statistics:
    Provide your reflections on the trends discussed above and statistics and supplemental information presented in this report.

B. **Request for Resources** *(suggested length of 1 page)*

    1. Request for Tenure-Track Hires: provide evidence from trends provided

    2. Request for Other Resources

APPENDIX B: Checklist for CAPR liaison who reviews the APR **and guiding checklist for author of the annual program report.**

NOTE TO CAPR REVIEWER:
Read the Annual Program Review submitted by the program by visiting the Five-year Reviews and Annual Reports by Department page on the Academic Senate website. Find the CAPR document that pertains to the last five year review (e.g. 08-09 CAPR 42). Read this document and identify the main issues raised by CAPR with respect to the five-year plan and the goals set for this program in the intervening five years to the next program review. Report back on the program and the degree to which the Annual Report a) addresses the five year planning horizon as appropriate, and b) addresses the specific elements as parsed out below (questions 1-4).

CAPR liaisons: **please** check the Annual Program Review, **and identify** whether the following information is **included** in the **submitted report:**

1. Does the Annual Program Review have a self-study?
   Yes __**(support with evidence starting with recommendations from last 5 year review, program learning outcomes, assessment strategies and results).**
   No __ (provide rationale for not including a self-study)

2. Does the Annual Program Review record progress with departmental planning and review? Does it describe progress toward the program's defined goals, any problems reaching its goals, any revisions to goals, and any new initiatives taken with respect to goals?
   Yes __ (**support with evidence)**
   No __ **(support with rationale for not reporting in this section)**

3. Does the Annual Program Review detail progress on fulfilling programmatic needs? Does it record significant events which have occurred or are imminent, such as changes to resources, retirements, new hires, curricular changes, honors received, online programs, loss of faculty, changes in enrollment, etc.?

   Yes __ **(support with evidence)**
   No __ **(support with rationale for not reporting in this section)**

4. Does the Annual Program Review have a summary of assessment results and ensuing or necessary revisions?
       Yes __**(support with evidence)**
       No __ **(support with rationale for not reporting in this section)**

A. Program learning outcome(s) (PLO) was/ were assessed:
Yes __ **(support with evidence)**
No __**(support with rationale for not reporting in this section)**

B. Assessment instrument(s) was/ were used to measure this PLO and clearly indicated:
Yes __ **(support with evidence)**
No __**(support with rationale for not reporting in this section)**

C. Participants/ courses were sampled to assess this PLO and clearly indicated:
Yes __**(support with evidence)**
 No __**(support with rationale for not reporting in this section)**

D. Assessment results were obtained, highlighting important findings from the data collected:
Yes __ **(support with evidence)**
No __**(support with rationale for not reporting in this section)**

E. Assessment results were (or will be) used as well as any revisions to the assessment process are clearly indicated ~~the results suggests are needed~~:
Yes __**(support with evidence)**
No __**(support with rationale for not reporting in this section)**

F. Annual Program Review contains a reflection upon progress made and changes with respect to the program learning outcomes assessment plan that is reported on in the five-year review self-study.
Yes __ **(support with evidence)**
No __**(support with rationale for not reporting in this section)**

5. Annual Program Review includes information about any associated minor(s).

Yes___**(support with evidence)**
No___**(support with rationale for not reporting in this section)**

6. Annual Program Review includes a discussion of program data?

Yes___**(support with evidence)**
No___**(support with rationale for not reporting in this section)**

7. Annual Program Review includes a request for additional resources including tenure-track hiring requests with support from program data. (Note: for programs submitting a 5-Year Academic Review in the same academic year, this is the only section required to be submitted by October 1st).

Yes___**(support with evidence)**
No___**(support with rationale for not reporting in this section.**

FIVE-YEAR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

I. INTRODUCTION TO FIVE-YEAR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAMS

An overview of the 5-year Academic Program Review Procedures can be found **in the Overview**

This document contains the instructions, timelines, workflow for 5-Year Academic Program Reviews with and without external accreditation **and 5-year curriculum assessment plan (18-19 CAPR: 22).**

The Academic Senate Office will provide assistance to CAPR and the Departments/Colleges in tracking the Five-Year Program Review Process and implementation of CAPR recommendations for review dates and approved postponements.

The Program Chair or Director is responsible for carrying out the curricular, structural, and assessment recommendations specified in the CAPR Program Review document and noting progress on these changes in the subsequent Annual Reports.

The College Dean or Dean's appointee will monitor the program's program review process to ensure timely and thoughtful completion of the Five Year Review and implementation of any CAPR recommendations in said Program Review documents.

II. INSTRUCTIONS FOR FIVE-YEAR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS FOR PROGRAMS *WITHOUT* EXTERNAL ACCREDITATION.

The Five-Year Academic Program Review without External Accreditation shall be formatted according to the guidelines listed below.

A. Contents for Five-Year Academic Program Reviews without External Accreditation.

1. Summary. This summary should consist of no more than two (2) pages of the entire report, ~~including all the items listed in~~

2. Self-Study. This should consist of 3-4 pages Each program shall use the Academic Performance Review Statistics from Planning and Institutional Research, Analysis and Decision Support (IRADS). In the year of a Five-Year Review, the last five years of data, including all data since the last 5 year review, will be used to support the program's Self-Study. In addition, the program will provide the following information in the Self-Study:

> **2.1. Summary of Previous Five-Year Review and Plan and subsequent Annual Program Reports.** This document will address a summary of the last program review and the plan developed at that time, discuss the program's progress in implementing that Plan and/or modification to the Plan as reported in its Annual Reports, and discuss any discrepancies between the last Program Review and the ensuing Annual Reports. This document

will also describe achievements of the program since the last review (if not mentioned above). For example, this could include important curricular changes, grants, faculty professional achievements, external honors received by students, changes in location or mode of instructional delivery.

2.2. Assessment and Curriculum: This section should contain a summary and analysis of the program's Assessment Plan. Reports that include multiple programs must contain a separate assessment summary for each program. This summary should contain the **5-year curriculum assessment plan (<u>18-19 CAPR: 22</u>) which includes the following components**:

> **a)** a list of the program's learning outcomes (PLOs)
> **b) a curriculum map demonstrating the alignment of courses to PLOs and ILOs**
> **c)** a description of what assessment measures have been used to measure each of the PLOs **including relevant ILO, GE, and Overlay academic assessment and co-curricular data**
> **d)** a summary of the findings from the program learning outcomes assessed since the last program review and indicate if the desired levels of learning were achieved from each of these assessments
> **e)** a discussion of any program improvement actions taken based on the findings
> **f)** a five-year assessment plan for the next academic cycle

If the program offers General Education or Overlay courses, a summary of data for program learning outcomes will be included, with a discussion of program or course offerings on the three campuses (Hayward, Concord, and Online), the Oakland Professional Center, and other venues.

For the two or more outcomes aligned to an ILO for each program, include a summary of the data provided along with a discussion of how the how the findings were or will be used to make curricular or other changes.

2.3. Student Success: Programs should discuss how they are addressing student success particularly with reference to retention rate, graduation rates, achievement gaps, course bottlenecks, use of high impact practices, advising, course redesign, and other measures.

2.4. External Comparisons. This section shall provide a review, showing how the department's course offerings and requirements compare to those of corresponding programs in the CSU system and to nationally recognized programs in the field.

2.5. General Program Discussion: The program should discuss in detail the data provided by IRADS, outline the current position of the program in terms of its resources, and how the program is seeking to address its program goals, program level outcomes , and university goals in the context of current resources and future trends. The program discussion should include, at a minimum, the following topics:

> **2.5.a)**   Student demographics of majors, minors, and options
> **2.5.b)**   Student level of majors, minors, and options
> **2.5.c)**   Faculty and academic resource allocation
> **2.5.d)**   Course data: Included will be summaries of climate and advising or scheduling surveys, as well as information on recruitment activities and materials. This includes online and face-to-face courses.

i. discussion of the impact on program quality of trends in enrollment, student-faculty ratio, percentage of courses and students taught by regular faculty, number of majors, and other relevant information must be included. If the diversity of the student body varies from the campus at large, discuss the potential reasons for this difference and the impact on program(s).

ii. If the diversity of the tenure track faculty and the faculty lecturers varies from the campus at large, discuss the potential reasons for this difference and the impact on program(s).

iii. Discuss the ratio of students who start out as first time freshmen in your program to those who started at the University as transfers, and the impact on program(s).

iv. Discuss the distribution of teaching resources in lower and upper division courses and the implications of this distribution on program(s).

v. Similarly, discuss the ratio of tenure track faculty to lecturers teaching in lower division courses and in upper division courses and the impact of those ratios on program(s).

vi. Discuss the ratio of students in lower division courses between the program and General Education and how that proportion affects the courses and the program(s).

vii. Discuss the ratio of students in upper division courses between the program and General Education and how that proportion affects the courses and the program(s).

viii. Discuss the courses and programs offered at Concord, including the number of each; potential changes to the offerings in the next five years; how the program in Concord aligns with programs at Hayward, Online, or other venues; and the impact of the programs/courses.

ix. Discuss the courses and programs offered online, including the number of each; potential changes to the offerings in the next five years; how the online program dovetails with programs at Hayward, Concord, or other venues; and the impact of the online programs/courses.

x. For graduate programs, provide application and enrollment data over the review period, and discuss any trends and their effect on program quality.

xi. Discuss other data elements as appropriate to the program(s).

2.6. Faculty: a copy of any applications submitted for new tenure-track positions since the last review will be attached, along with a discussion of progress toward achieving these positions.

2.7. Resources: the program's reliance on campus support units will be discussed and a response from any units from which the program requires additional or unusual services (for example, Library, Information Technology, Assistive Technology, Instructional Support, Facilities, Center for Community Engagement, etc.) shall be attached.

2.8. Requirements: Justification for programs requiring more than the typical minimum number of units (120), (the larger number of units required for the baccalaureate degree) shall be included.

3. Plan. The **5-year** Academic Program Review will describe plans for change and improvement in order to maintain leadership in the respective fields,**in 2-3 pages.** Therefore, each program shall develop a plan for the next five years. Development of this plan should benefit programs applying for new tenure-track positions by providing information to support and justify these requests.

The Five-Year Plan will address the recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study. The plan will take into account what the faculty has learned from the Outcomes Assessment process. A draft of the Plan will be provided to the External Reviewer. After receiving the External Reviewer's Report, the program review committee shall either amend the draft plan to comply with the recommendations of the External Reviewer or explain why no amendment is necessary.

Elements of the **following** five areas (3.1 – 3.5) addressed in the Plan should include the following, where relevant:
    i.   The expected action/change to be taken, e.g., revision of curriculum, addition of faculty, purchase of equipment, etc.
    ii.   A specific timeline for completing the task.
    iii.   Person(s) responsible for carrying out the needed change.
    iv.   Anticipated cost.

In forming this plan, the program shall address the following five areas (these questions provide guidelines):

    3.1. Curriculum. What curricular changes do you envision during the next five years? What developments are likely to cause you to change the curriculum? Discuss prospects and changes relevant to all campuses and locations relevant to your program—Hayward, Concord, Online, the Oakland Center, etc. What changes are planned for General Education? Discuss any relevant changes to a multicultural learning experience. Discuss any changes to your curriculum associated with SB1440 The STAR Act for Associate Degree transfer, if applicable.

    3.2 Assessment. What were the results of the actions taken in the previous assessment cycle? What is the program's assessment plan for the next five years? What if any changes will you make to your Program Learning Outcomes? **What is your schedule for assessing your PLOs and relevant ILO, GE, and \Overlay outcomes?** What assessment processes will you be using to assess your PLOs and other relevant outcomes?

    3.3. Students Success. Do you see the number of students majoring in your program increasing or decreasing during the next five years? Refer back to the statistics provided in your Self-Study. Do you anticipate new programs or outreach to new student populations? Will the career opportunities open to your graduates change during the next five years? How will your program adjust its curriculum and program practices to prepare students for those opportunities? Do you expect your total enrollment to increase or decrease during the next five years? What are your plans for improving advising and retention for students in the program? Are changes needed in the program's learning outcomes? How will you support student learning in order to attain those outcomes during the next five years? What are your specific plans in the areas of curriculum change, outreach, scheduling and retention, to increase student success? If your program has inadequate resources to serve your students, what does the program require? Are the lines of communication open between students and faculty? Are there other important climate issues that should be addressed?

Please support assertions with reference to relevant program data. Assertions regarding career opportunities, job demand, changes in the field of study, etc. must be supported by appropriate sources and data.

3.4. **Faculty.** What changes do you foresee for the program faculty? What does the University need to do to maintain or improve the current faculty? Do you anticipate that you will be requesting new regular faculty members? If so, what will be the basis for these requests? Are the lines of communication open between leadership and faculty? Are there other important climate issues that should be addressed? What special challenges involve workload and RTP issues? Is advising shared fully by the faculty?

3.5. Resources. Will your current level of resources (staff, equipment, library resources, travel funds, etc.) be adequate to permit the maintenance or improvement of program quality during the next five years? Identify needs based up on program priorities.

4. External Reviewer's Report **(2 pages).** Every Five-year Review must include an External Reviewer. To assist the review process, the External Reviewer will receive:

a) a copy of the "Principles Regarding Faculty Participation in Tenure-Track Allocation Procedures"
b) the program's institutional data
c) the Self-Study, including all attachments
d) annual reports written since the previous five-year review
e) the Plan
f) the Mission Statements of both the University and the Program
g) any additional documents the program deems helpful

The External Reviewer will meet with the Dean, the Program Chair/Director, faculty, students, staff, library liaison, and others during the on-site visit.

The External Reviewer's Report shall address the program's strengths as well as weaknesses, and offer suggestions for improvement of the program, fulfillment of its mission and enhancement of its position with respect to system-wide and national trends. A completed copy of the External Reviewer's ~~Rubric~~ comments and supportive evidence should be attached to the report.

Refer to the CAPR website for detailed information about the External Reviewer appointment selection process.

5. Program's Response (2 pages). Upon receiving the External Reviewer's Report, the faculty of the program will respond in writing. Recommendations, concerns and issues raised by the External Reviewer will be addressed in light of the Mission Statement, program need, the Plan, fiscal limitations and logistical issues.

6. Dean's Acknowledgement. The Five-Year Program Review should include a statement from the Dean acknowledging that he/she has reviewed the Five-Year program review document and will monitor the program's program review process to ensure timely and thoughtful completion of the Five Year Review of any CAPR recommendations in said Program Review documents. The Dean should include a short response to the five-year plan and its resource implication.

7. Program Review Submission

The Program's Response to the External Reviewer's Report and an electronic file of the entire Five-Year Program Review will be forwarded electronically to the Senate Office by May 15 of the review year, along with the Self-Study, the Plan (as amended following the External Reviewer's Report), and all other documentation required for the Review. The CAPR oral review will not be held until all documents are in place.

II. B. Timeline for Five-Year Academic Program Reviews without External Accreditation.

Summer: Senate Office will update the 5-Year Program Review Schedule and post it to the web and send the link to all faculty, the Deans/Assoc Deans, and the Provost/Assoc Provost

August: Notification of 5 Year Review is initiated by the CAPR Chair and sent to Program Chairs by the Senate Office and cc to the Dean.

October 1: Review committee is finalized by program faculty. The review committee will assume responsibility for the preparation of the Self-Study and Five-Year Plan. Program Chair submits request for approval of External Review to College Dean, then forwarded to Dean APS. .

November 1: Postponement requests, with full justification, are due and must be signed by the college Dean. Program representation MUST attend the meeting to answer CAPR questions regarding the request.

By the Academic Recess Date of the Fall Semester: Submit the Self-Study and Five-Year Plan and designation of the External Reviewer(s) to both CAPR and the college dean. The report should include assessment data up through the spring semester of the previous academic year. Please note that late submissions may affect resource allocation for your program.

January: A date for the External Reviewer Visitation will be set and that date will be provided to CAPR. The Program Chair or designee will provide the External Reviewer with the Self-Study and Five-Year Plan and other appropriate materials prior to the visitation date. The External Reviewer's Report should be received by the department by March 31st. A representative of the program provides a brief status report to update CAPR on 5-year report submission progress.

April: The College Dean or Associate Dean shall meet with the Program Review Committee to review and discuss the Self-Study, the draft Five-Year Plan, and the External Reviewer's report. The External Reviewer's Report is due in electronic format to the Senate Office by April 30th. The College Dean shall submit written comments to the Program's Review Committee for consideration by the program faculty in order for the program faculty to prepare a written response to the External Reviewer's Report(s) and finalize an amended Five-Year Plan, if needed.

By the Academic Recess date of the Spring semester (May 15th): The Response to the Reviewer's Report and Revised plan are due in electronic format to the Senate Office. An electronic copy of the entire 5 Year Program Review (in the required format and with a program summary page and copies of all of the Annual Reports submitted to CAPR since the prior 5 Year Program Review) are also due in the Senate Office on the last day of the academic year. The Provost and College Dean will be notified if a submission is not received by the deadline.

In the beginning of the Fall Semester the following academic year, CAPR will set a meeting date sometime during the Fall Semester for program representatives to meet with CAPR to discuss the review submission. All 5-Year reviews completed by the program during the prior fiscal year will be forwarded to the Academic Senate during the academic year following the submission deadline.

MOU meetings will be convened by the Provost (or designee) as appropriate and it is expected that all reviews will have gone through the Senate and completed the MOU process by the end of the academic year. As part of its 5-

Year Program Review Report to the Senate, CAPR will submit a report including its recommendations regarding the program, and the summary provided in the Program's Five-Year Review Self-Study. Following Senate approval of CAPR's recommendations and memo, the Provost will review the summary and meet with members of the department under review and the CAPR chair at a time mutually agreeable during the Spring term to devise a clear 5-year plan moving forward. The Provost will then create a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Department and return that MOU to the Senate as an information item as soon as possible (completion of a MOU may require extension into the following Fall semester given scheduling timelines).

III. INSTRUCTIONS FOR FIVE-YEAR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW FOR PROGRAMS *WITH* EXTERNAL ACCREDITATION

Programs that must complete an accreditation review will, **upon completion of their review**, submit to CAPR evidence of the positive outcome of this review in order to be granted continuation status by CAPR. Should they fail to receive outside accreditation, they must comply, in full, with the non-accredited reporting requirements within the current or subsequent academic year, as arranged with the CAPR Chair. The calendar for the Five-year Academic Review will be written to coincide with the accreditation visits of those programs. Communication with CAPR and APS concerning these timelines shall be maintained in case accreditation dates change.

A. Contents for Five-Year Academic Program Reviews with External Accreditation.

.

Programs that must complete an accreditation review shall submit to CAPR the following items:

1. Appropriate documentation (e.g. a confirmation letter) from its outside accreditation authorities (e.g. NCATE) indicating that it has been granted accredited status in its field of instruction, along with a summary of the main findings of its outside accrediting body.

2. Submission Summary. This shall summarize in no more than five (5) pages the entire report, including items 3-5 below.

3. Plan. Follow the requirements listed in Section 3 for programs *without* external accreditation.

4. Units. For programs requiring more than 120 units in the baccalaureate degree, a memo justifying the need for the larger number of units or detailing how the required units will be reduced to 120. If an Associate's Degree for Transfer exists (under SB 1440, also known as the STAR Act) for the program, indicate if the transfer degree was determined to be "similar" (meaning students holding this degree would be able to complete the Bachelor's degree and any options or concentrations in 60 semester units). If any changes to the curriculum have occurred since the last program review, indicate how those changes have affected the requirements of SB 1440. Provide a list of other CSUs and California Community Colleges that have approved the STAR Act curriculum in question (contact APS if assistance is needed).

5. Accreditation Guidelines. A copy of the outside accreditation review documentation and a copy of the guidelines, criteria or other requirements of the outside accrediting body.

B. Timeline for Five-Year Academic Program Reviews with External Accreditation.

(Note: Since accreditation takes place at various times of the year, there is not a specific timeline for this process. Reporting requirements are based upon requirements of the accreditation body.)

Summer: Senate Office will update the 5-Year Program Review Schedule and post it to the web and send the link to all faculty, the Deans/Associate Deans, and the Provost/Associate Provost

August: Program Chair will check the Program Review Schedule posted on the web and will notify the Senate Office if the date of the anticipated accreditation review is different from that stated on the Review Schedule.

Same date as deadline for Submission of the Accreditation Review Materials: The Program Chair will provide an electronic copy of the entire accreditation submission to the Senate Office, with a cover letter stating the approximate timeline for the accreditation review, including the approximate time that they expect to receive accreditation confirmation.

In the following weeks the program will collect and or compile the additional materials required by CAPR (in the required format and with a program summary page and copies of all of the Annual Reports submitted to CAPR since the prior 5 Year Program Review). These materials will be provided electronically to the Senate Office no later than the end of the Spring Semester and prior to receipt of the confirmation of accreditation.

The letter from the accreditation body confirming accreditation will be sent to the Senate Office when received by the program, along with an electronic copy of the required materials and an electronic copy of the accreditation submission.

In the beginning of Fall Semester of the following academic year, CAPR will set a meeting date sometime during the Fall Semester for program representatives to meet with CAPR to discuss the review submission.

MOU meetings will be convened by the Provost (or designee) with the intent of finalizing the process during the academic year in which confirmation of accreditation is received. Following Senate approval of CAPR's recommendations and memo, the Provost will review the summary and meet with members of the department under review and the CAPR chair at a time mutually agreeable during the Spring term to devise a clear 5-year plan moving forward. The Provost will then create a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Department and return that MOU to the Senate as an information item as soon as possible (completion of a MOU may require extension into the following Fall semester given scheduling timelines).

IV. REQUESTS FOR DELAY or EXTENSION OF FIVE-YEAR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS

1.   Minor procedural delays within the academic year are generally granted with the expectation that the program will adhere to the timeline as closely as possible. Requests for such delays are made to CAPR in writing through the Senate Office, with written approval from the Dean.

2.   Programs *with* external accreditation are granted an automatic date change on the Program Review Schedule to coincide with the receipt of the approved external accreditation. The need for such change is made to CAPR in writing through the Senate Office, with written concurrence from the Dean.

3. Programs *without* external accreditation requesting a full year extension (postponement) of their scheduled **5-Year** Academic Program Review must use the following process:

    a. The request for extension shall provide a detailed explanation of the extraordinary circumstances motivating the request. Approval by the Dean of the program's college shall accompany the written request, addressed to the Chair of CAPR and delivered to the Academic Senate Office. The request for a one year extension from CAPR shall be submitted no later than the **first CAPR meeting of November (and must be signed by the Dean)** during the year in which the review is originally scheduled. In extraordinary circumstances, CAPR has approved two-year extensions.

    b. If an extension is approved, in order to prepare for the following year's review, the program shall submit a progress report (or draft submission) by May 1 of the academic year in which the APR was originally scheduled, indicating the state of data collection and preparation of the APR document. ~~The program shall schedule the external review during the Fall Semester of the extension year, to occur as early as possible CAPR will receive the completed program review no later than January 31st of the extension year~~. **(The program will then resume regular deadlines and the regular CAPR 5 year review cycle).**

V. REQUEST EARLY REVIEW OR DISCONTINUANCE OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM

Programs may request an earlier review (less than five years) or earlier status determination, including discontinuance or suspension, at the request of the Program or Academic Programs & Services. Requests should be directed in writing to the Chair of CAPR.

VI. PROCEDURES FOR RESOLVING MISSING OR INCOMPLETE SUBMISSIONS

When CAPR cannot resolve submission difficulties, the Chair of CAPR may notify the Dean and Associate Dean, as well as the Senate Chair, with requests for additional information.

If the program's External Reviewer's Report *has not been received* by the Senate Office by the end of Spring term, the CAPR Chair, in concert with the Academic Senate Chair, will send a memo to the Dean and the Provost notifying them of the lack of compliance with the CAPR timeline with a copy to the Program Chair/Director. In that memo, CAPR may set a new date for the review in the next academic year.

If the Response to the **External** Reviewer's Report and Revised Plan are *incomplete* on May 15, CAPR will prepare a review document with the notation that the submission was not complete and that CAPR will **devise a new deadline for submission of full report**. ~~formally request discontinuance~~. **~~The CAPR members shall return all copies of the review materials and archived by the Academic Senate Office, for use by the CAPR members in the following year.~~ These documents will be archived on the CAPR website**. These steps will advise the next CAPR of what needs to be done in the next year. Tenure track requests will not be considered without a current Five-Year Review that has been approved by the Academic Senate and without regular annual reports.

VII. CAPR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FIVE-YEAR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS

CAPR shall determine one of four possible recommendations for the program:

a) Continuation *without* modification;

Programs with this recommendation generally have the following characteristics:

· responsive to previous five-year review, including progress towards goals identified in the previous plan and external reviewer recommendations;
· a strategic plan for the next five years;
·on-going and consistent assessment of program learning outcomes;
· act on assessment results, i.e. has an iterative assessment process;
· discusses data and its implications for the program;
· closes the loop on assessment (analyzes results of actions taken as a result of the previous review period);
· program is addressing any equity gaps;
· five-year reviews and annual reports are completed in a timely fashion;
· program is effectively meeting demand for majors and providing service courses (where applicable);
· program is maintaining an appropriate density of tenure-track faculty;
· program is continuing to graduate students regularly.

b) Continuation *with* modification, to be specifically identified by CAPR, with a report or reports to CAPR about progress on the modification, either through the annual reports or on a timeline to be specified by CAPR.

Specifically, the program doesn't meet with the requirements for *Continuation without modification* and the required modification is an error or process that is easily-corrected. This recommendation would indicate a simple fix or change that can be completed before the next annual review.

c) Continuation of the program for a specific amount of time, with annual monitoring by CAPR and the Dean of issues identified in the program review, either through the annual reports or on a timeline to be specified by CAPR.

Specifically, the program doesn't meet with the requirements of *Continuation without modification* and the problem is more systemic or long-term. This recommendation would indicate a more complex issue. **Note:** programs experiencing challenges listed under *Discontinuance* should be given this designation before a recommendation of *Discontinuance.* This would also be used for programs that have received a recommendation of *Continuation with specified modification* in the past and that have failed to take corrective action.

d) Discontinuance of the Program

This recommendation would indicate that there are serious concerns about the program. This may include, but is not limited to:

1. Non-probationary loss of accreditation.
2. Declining student headcount over time and dropping service FTES.
3. On-going lack of assessment or failure to address assessment results where improvement is warranted.

4. Failure to address equity gap
5. Reduction of tenure-track faculty to very low levels.
6. Failure to correct modification requests.
7. Unsatisfactory conclusion of CAPR monitoring period.
8. Failure to submit five-year program review.

Programs generally should not receive a *Discontinuance* designation without having been giving a *Continuance with monitoring / Continuance with specific modifications* recommendation outlining the concerns that would lead to discontinuance.

Based on the review, CAPR may also make recommendations regarding allocation of resources, especially tenure-track faculty, for the program. CAPR will attach to its final response the Executive Summary from the Program's Self-Study.

Following approval of the CAPR summary and memo by the Senate, the Provost will review the summary and meet with members of that department or program and the CAPR chair at a mutually agreeable time during the Spring term to devise a clear 5-year plan moving forward. The Provost will then create a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with that department or program and return that MOU to the Senate as an information item as soon as possible (completion of a MOU may require extension into the following Fall semester given scheduling timelines).

Appendix A: Submission Expectations for Five-Year Program Reviews
Cover-Sheet Template for Five-Year Program Review

California State University, East Bay

5-Year Program Review for
[insert program name]

[insert academic year of the review]

Self-Study and 5-Year Plan approved by faculty on: [insert date; insert results of faculty vote]

External Reviewer Report received by the program on: [insert date]

Program's Response to External Reviewer's Report completed on: [insert date]

Complete 5-Year Program Review Report submitted to CAPR on: [insert date]

[NOTE: Please follow this format closely, including title page and table of contents, for your organization of your 5-year Review Report. **Please remove** all explanatory notes below to complete your plan.]

Submission Expectations for Five-Year Program Reviews
Table of Contents Template

Table of Contents

(add pages numbers when complete)

Appendix B: CAPR Five-Year Academic Program Review Checklist

	Present	**Evidence**

Program Summary		
Summary of Previous Review / Five Year Plan		
Program Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan		
Course Offerings		
GE Course Assessment (if applicable)		
Inclusion and Analysis of Student Performance Review Statistics		
Faculty		
Campus Resources		
Unit Requirements and Transfer Model Curriculum		
5 Year Plan: Curriculum		
5 Year Plan: Students		
Dean's Letter of Support		
5 Year Plan: Faculty		
5 Year Plan: Resources		

External Reviewer Report		
Response to External Reviewer Report		
MOU meeting with Provost (projected date)		

Appendix C: External Reviewer's Guidelines & Responsibilities (needs to be revised and add more during the 2019-2020 academic year)

1. **Overview**
2. **Selection Criteria (with link to request form)**
3. **External Reviewer Report – includes a summary of the programs goals, activities and outcomes, alignment and evidence for achievement of goals; summary of meetings with personnel and recommendations for implementation of improvements in a set of 5 year goals.**

Appendix D. CAPR Format for Response to Five-Year Program Reviews (approved December, 2018)

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY

DESIGNATION CODE: [year] CAPR [number]
DATE SUBMITTED: [insert date]

TO: The Academic Senate

FROM: The Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR)

SUBJECT: Five-Year Program Review for [insert program]

PURPOSE: For Action by the Academic Senate

ACTION REQUESTED: [insert request]

1.0: Background

At its meeting on [date/ year], CAPR invited [insert name] from the [program] to discuss the program's 20XX-XX five-year review. Following this meeting, the liaison to the department/ program worked with the writer of the 5-year review to complete the following summary. This summary will be useful for preparing the yearly summary from CAPR to the Senate and to the Provost.

Briefly describe the program(s), number of students served, faculty and refer to five-year reports for additional information. Can be copied and inserted from the 5-year review.

2.0: Checklist of documents submitted with the 5-year review – are all of these present? Note where items are forthcoming and a date by which these will be completed. Links to these documents or references to the pages on which these exist in the 5-year review will suffice.
- Self Study
- Five-year plan
- External reviewer's report

- Program response to the external reviewer's report
- Accreditation documents (if applicable)

3.0: CAPR Analysis

An executive summary and recommendation for program continuation is proposed. It should be no more than 1-2 pages and should be written by the CAPR liaison in partnership with the department/program chair.

Proposed parts:

- Discuss the strengths and assets of the program with respect to faculty, student success, curriculum, program enhancement, assessment plans
  as well as notable accomplishments.
- Describe the key issues and/or concerns that were central to the five-year year review process and how the department/program plans to address them.
- Note the program's vision for the next five years and what the program hopes to accomplish.
- Provide concrete steps on how the program plans to achieve its vision in the next five years.

4.0: CAPR Recommendation(s) for Continuation of the Program – *please refer to the CAPR policy document as needed **(need new link to updated policy)**

*Choices and general rationale:

- Continuation *without* modification (from page 4, of capr-academic-program-review-16-17)
  - responsive to previous five-year review, including progress towards goals identified in the previous plan and external reviewer recommendations;
  - a strategic plan for the next five years;
  - on-going and consistent assessment of program learning outcomes;
  - act on assessment results, i.e. has an iterative assessment process;
  - discusses data and its implications for the program;
  - closes the loop on assessment;
  - program is addressing any achievement gaps;
  - five-year reviews and annual reports are completed in a timely fashion;
  - program is effectively meeting demand for majors and providing service courses (where applicable);
  - program is maintaining an appropriate density of tenure-track faculty;
  - program is continuing to graduate students regularly.

- Continuation *with* modification (from page 4-5, of capr-academic-program-review-16-17)
  - to be specifically identified by CAPR, with a report or reports to CAPR about progress on the modification, either through the annual reports or on a timeline to be specified by CAPR;

  - Specifically, the program doesn't meet with the requirements for *Continuation without modification* and the required modification is an error or process that is easily-corrected. This recommendation would indicate a simple fix or change that can be completed before the next annual review.

- Continuation of the program for a specific amount of time, *with annual monitoring by CAPR* and the Dean of

issues identified in the program review, either through the annual reports or on a timeline to be specified by CAPR;

- o Specifically, the program doesn't meet with the requirements of *Continuation without modification* and the problem is more systemic or long-term. This recommendation would indicate a more complex issue. Programs experiencing challenges listed under *Discontinuance* should be given this designation before a recommendation of *Discontinuance*. This would also be used for programs that have received a recommendation of *Continuation with specified modification* in the past and that have failed to take corrective action.

- Discontinuation
  This recommendation would indicate that there are serious concerns about the program. This may include, but is not limited to:
    - o Non-probationary loss of accreditation.
    - o Declining student headcount over time and dropping service FTES.
    - o On-going lack of assessment.
    - o Failure to address achievement gaps.
    - o Reduction of tenure-track faculty to very low levels.
    - o Failure to correct modification requests.
    - o Unsatisfactory conclusion of CAPR monitoring period.
    - o Failure to submit five-year review.

Programs generally should not receive a *Discontinuance* designation without having been giving a *Continuance with monitoring / Continuance with specific modifications* recommendation outlining the concerns that would lead to discontinuance.

5.0 Summary:

As part of the executive summary, the CAPR liaison should note the recommendation for continuation. If the decision is continuation with modification, then CAPR should state the reason and set explicit goals that will help the program remedy the issues. If the decision is to continue without modification, a discussion of suggestions for improvement by CAPR should be noted.

Following approval of the CAPR summary and memo by the Senate, the Provost will review the summary and meet with members of that department or program and the CAPR chair at a mutually agreeable time during the Spring term to devise a clear 5-year plan moving forward. The Provost will then create a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with that department or program and return that MOU to the Senate as an information item as soon as possible (completion of a MOU may require extension into the following Fall semester given scheduling timelines).