

## CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY

Designation Code: **05-06 CAPR 9**  
Date Submitted: February 20, 2006

TO: The Academic Senate  
FROM: Committee on Academic Planning & Review (CAPR)  
SUBJECT: Program Evaluation and Planning  
PURPOSE: Action by the Academic Senate

### ACTION

REQUESTED: That the Academic Senate approve these revised Procedures and Guidelines for the Five-Year Program Review Process and other Interrelated Processes. Further, that CAPR will be charged with revisiting these processes in 2008-2009 for the purpose of evaluation of their effectiveness and revision of any procedures which can be improved; effective upon the signature of the president.

### BACKGROUND

INFORMATION: The Committee on Academic Planning & Review (CAPR) was charged with the task of researching faculty governance documents related to program reviews, self-studies, and other interrelated processes, such as faculty-participation in the tenure-track hiring process, including:

- The Committee A report;
- 98-99 BEC 6, and its amendments 00-01 BEC 11, and 02-03 BEC 3;
- 2000-01 CAPR 7, Policies and Procedures for Five-Year Reviews and Plans;
- 93-94 CAPR 2, Policy on Review of Academic Plans, the document which initially created the Annual Report (Section 2.2);
- the new timeline for tenure track hiring, developed through consensus, and approved for one year by the Senate on May 31, 2005;
- 02-03 CAPR 1, Outside Accredited Programs;
- the current CAPR Policies and Procedures document, and
- Relevant portions of the WASC self-study, particularly the Academic COT materials.

Chair Sawyer asked CAPR to renew and streamline the operational documents to reflect the current practices, and to provide effective guidelines and expectations involved for department submissions, while maximizing faculty input in practical ways. Another goal for CAPR was to combine the above into one document which maintained a coherent structure for academic reviews and other related processes, providing a single document for reference rather than many separate documents. The CAPR Chair met with the Senate Chair and the Provost to discuss envisioned processes. The CAPR Chair attended Committee on Budget Resource Allocation (COBRA) meetings with Council of Chairs (COC) where COC processes were discussed. CAPR members reviewed and combined the preceding documents (and other relevant materials), strove to remove references to outdated documents and to add more transparency to both CAPR's process and the outside reviewer's responsibilities. WHEN approved by the Senate and upon the signature of the President, these procedures supersede the separate documents currently in use as listed above, and combine faculty thinking from the 2003-2004 self-study portion of the WASC Review process.

The WASC Academic COT recommends and CAPR concurs with the reinstatement of a Program Annual Report as described in 93-94 CAPR-2, in a reduced format (See Section III of this document). Each program ("programs" for review purposes are defined-as "units offering degrees", as listed on the Academic Plan and reflected in the Program Review Schedule with the addition of the General Education program and the Library; additionally, bodies engaging in faculty hiring for educational purposes which do not offer degrees will be subject to providing an Annual Report if the Dean requests one) will provide a brief (3 page) Annual Report to be submitted to the Dean **early** in the Spring Quarter, with a copy to CAPR. This Annual Report shall include updates of program learning outcomes assessment activity, Student Learning Outcomes, and complimented by other program performance data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment to help the

University measure student success and the academic quality of its programs. The Annual Report shall provide updated information and communicate the short-term planning goals between the program and appropriate administrators. The Annual Report will be given to the respective Dean as a tool to inform the tenure track resource allocation process at the college level, filed in the Senate Office with the current Five-Year Review and Plan documents and will be reviewed by CAPR as part of the five-year review process.

A procedure for requesting a delay or extension in an Academic Program Review (APR) was developed because CAPR 2004-05 believed that formal scheduling procedures would serve the University in meeting required review schedules and maintaining a clear path for programs to follow.

Several reasons to support CAPR's position:

- Program reviews are required at five-year intervals. Program reviews must be summarized and reported in a timely manner to the Chancellor's Office. Program reviews also influence the WASC Accreditation process and delays are troublesome for the institutional review.
- It is advantageous when prioritizing College tenure track hiring needs for most programs to have similarly current review documents and comparable assessment documents relevant to that review. CAPR reviews provide specific and meaningful data to augment any tenure-track request.
- APRs provide substantive support for programs, programmatic changes, and faculty tenure-track requests.

The Annual Report is a valuable mechanism to hold departments and the administration jointly accountable for academic program quality and provide departments with the following benefits:

- Documentation of actions toward fulfilling their five year plans
- Documentation of administrative commitments made during the last program review and notations 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 Dean, the CAPR Chair and the Senate
- 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 to 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. New chairs will no longer be left in the situation of trying to create a five year review with little or no information from the prior years.
- The Five Year Program Review will be much easier to accomplish with 5 Annual Reports to refer to; chairs only need to add the planning piece and arguments for additional support; the basic data required for CAPR reports will already be in place
- The Annual Reports will be valuable to the outside reviewers
- Annual 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

CAPR unanimously approved Procedures for requesting a delay/extension at its meeting on November 4, 2004, which were part of CAPR's revised Policies and Procedures. CAPR unanimously approved this entire CAPR 9 document at its meeting on May 5, 2005 and subsequent revisions at its meetings on February 16 and March 2, 2006.

The attached document serves primarily to consolidate many documents with few changes. As previously noted, the Annual Report and the Tenure Track Hiring Process are the major areas of proposed change. CAPR has been working on this for two years, and respectfully requests that the Senate approve the following policy and charge CAPR with revisiting these processes in 2008-2009 for the purpose of evaluation of their effectiveness, and revision of any procedures which can be improved or superseded.

# PROGRAM EVALUATION AND PLANNING

## Table of Contents

Page

### **The Five-Year Program Review**

<b>I. ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES</b>	<b>2</b>
A. INTRODUCTION	3
B. Program Reviews without external accreditation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review Timeline</li><li>• Program Submission Contents</li></ul>	4
C. Program Reviews <i>with</i> External Accreditation <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Review Timeline</li><li>• Program Submission Contents</li></ul>	9
D. Requests for Delays or Extensions in Academic Program Reviews	11
E. Missing or Incomplete Submission	11
F. Monitoring of Program Review Process	11

### **Planning and the Tenure Track Allocation Process**

<b>II. ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT</b>	<b>12</b>
A. INTRODUCTION and Planning Discussions	13
B. Annual Report Format	14
<b>III. FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN THE TENURE-TRACK ALLOCATION PROCESS</b>	<b>16</b>
Annual University Timeline	16

<b>Appendices</b>	<b>18</b>
-------------------	-----------

<b>IV. CHECKLISTS AND RUBRICS</b>	<b>19</b>
-----------------------------------	-----------

# THE FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM REVIEW

## I. ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

	Page number
A. INTRODUCTION	3
B. Program Reviews without external accreditation.	4
• Review Timeline	
• Program Submission Contents	
C. Program Reviews <i>with</i> External Accreditation	9
• Review Timeline	
• Program Submission Contents	
D. Requests for Delays in Academic Program Reviews	11
E. Missing or Incomplete Submission	11
F. Monitoring of Program Review Process	11

# I. ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

## A. INTRODUCTION

### ROLE OF DEPARTMENTS AND PROGRAMS, COLLEGES, FACULTY GOVERNANCE AND UNIVERSITY

Departments and Programs will prepare the Annual Reports and Academic Program Reviews in a timely manner. Copies of the Annual Reports, and the Academic Program Review (Five-Year Review), will be submitted to the appropriate College Dean and 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 and realignment. 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. As part of its Program Review Report to the Senate, CAPR will prepare a one-page executive summary. This one-page summary will provide the basis for a discussion among the Provost; the appropriate Dean; and Chair/Director, and/or faculty of the program.

Following Senate approval of CAPR's recommendations, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee) will meet with the Program Director/Department Chair(s), Dean (or designee), CAPR Chair, and other appropriate administrators, to discuss the program and recommendations for change. At the close of the meeting the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will prepare a memorandum (MOU) identifying the agreed upon recommendations to be implemented and identifying the resources needed to support the recommendations.

The assessment and planning expressed in the review process, presented in a combination of both annual and 5 Year Academic Review Reports, will be an integral part of the resource allocation process.

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. 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 utilize Program Review as an instrument of planning from which emerge criteria for resource allocation, including new tenure-track faculty hires.

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

1. **Accountability:** Academic program review is one way to ensure to students, parents, Board of Trustees, WASC and the public it serves that CSUEB is providing quality programs;
2. **Program Improvement:** The academic 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 quality program improvement; and

3. **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.

CAPR has determined that, at CSUEB, academic program review will be required for any degree, certificate, or credential in a particular field of study; and shall include curricular programs such as General Education and Liberal Studies; and University wide resources as the Library and Computing Services. The Program Review Schedule will be updated annually and posted on the Academic Senate website.

## **B. ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES**

For Programs *without* external accreditation

### **Timeline for Program Reviews *without* external accreditation.**

1. Each spring CAPR will notify programs that are to undergo program review during the next academic year.
2. Each Department or program conducting a review will select a committee of the whole or a Program Review Committee of at least three members for each program to be reviewed. In consultation with program faculty and representative students, the committee will assume responsibility for the preparation of the Self-Study and Five-Year Plan as prescribed in B below.
3. An External Reviewer will be selected from a list of possible reviewers maintained by the Department and College containing prospective reviewers best meeting written specifications for desired characteristics of an external reviewer for particular academic programs at CSUEB. This list will be developed, where possible, from a list of such reviewers prepared by a national association. The list will be continually updated through consultations among the Provost, AVP, Deans, and Department Chairs or Program Directors. The appropriate Dean will approve the final selection. The program will contact the External Reviewer, set the site visit date, and notify CAPR of this information by November 1<sup>st</sup>.
4. The Program Review Committee shall complete the Self-Study and a draft of the new Five-Year Plan by the end of the Fall Quarter of the review year.
5. The program will send the External Reviewer all materials noted in “Section 3. Outside Reviewer’s Report”. The External Reviewer will visit the site and meet with faculty, students, the Dean, and others. Upon receipt of the completed External Reviewer’s Report by the program and Dean, the Dean shall award an agreed upon honorarium to the External Reviewer.
6. 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. Within two weeks of receiving the External Reviewer’s report the College Dean shall submit written comments to the Program 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 and finalize an amended Five-Year Plan, if needed.
7. The program faculty shall forward all documents to the Senate Office by March 1 of the review year. The program chair shall be responsible for ensuring the completion of the program review. The title page of the program review document shall verify that the program faculty has approved the Self-Study and the (Amended) Five-Year Plan and will note the date of approval.

8. CAPR, following written guidelines and protocols in the Policies and Procedures for Committee Operations, will examine the Program's completed Five-Year Review documents and will meet with the Program Chair/Director, faculty, and others deemed appropriate.
9. CAPR shall write its final report to the Senate, utilizing a consistent format that summarizes the specific areas of the Self-Study with supporting data, the (amended) Plan, the External Reviewer's Recommendations and the Program's Response. CAPR shall determine one of four possible recommendations for the program:
  - a) Continuation *without* modification (this may include continuation without modification, but including implementation of the recommendations specifically identified by CAPR and agreed upon in the MOU, as described below in #10);
  - b) Continuation *with* modification, to be specifically identified by CAPR, with a report or reports to CAPR about progress on the modification, on a timeline to be specified by CAPR;
  - 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;
  - d) Discontinuance of the Program.

Based on the review, CAPR may also make recommendations regarding allocation of resources, especially tenure-track faculty, for the program. CAPR will attach to the final report an executive summary of the major findings of the program review.

10. Following Senate approval of CAPR's recommendations, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee) will meet with the Program Director, Department Chair(s), Dean (or designee), CAPR Chair, and other appropriate administrators, to discuss the program and recommendations for change during the next five years. At the close of the meeting the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee) will prepare a memorandum (MOU) identifying the agreed upon recommendations to be implemented, as well as the resources that will be provided to support the recommendations during the next five years.
11. The Provost will forward the memorandum to the Department, College, CAPR, and the Chair of the Academic Senate.

**Contents of Academic Program Reviews for Programs *without* external accreditation.** The Five-Year Review document shall consist of the previous program review and the ensuing annual reports together with: 1) a Self-Study, 2) a Plan, 3) the Outside Reviewer's Report, and 4) the Program's Response to the Outside Reviewer's Report.

1. **Self-study.** Each program shall utilize the Academic Performance Review Statistics from Institutional Research and Assessment (available annually for all programs, including those not undergoing an Academic Review) to maintain a current file of statistical information. In the year of a Five-Year Review, the most recent five-year statistical profile will be used to support the program's Self-study. In addition, the program will provide the following information in the Self-Study:
  - a. **Summary:** 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, 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, important curricular changes, grants, faculty professional achievements, external honors received by students, changes in location or mode of instructional delivery.

- b. **Curriculum and Student Learning:** a copy of the program's Outcomes Assessment document, which summarizes the data and what has been learned from this information, the steps the program has taken in response, and what further steps should be taken will be attached.

This document provides 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.

If the program offers General Education courses, a summary of data for student learning outcomes will be included, with a discussion of program or course offerings at the Concord Campus and the program's multi-cultural learning activities, if relevant.

- c. **Students, advising, and retention:** this document uses the Academic Performance Review Statistics available from Institutional Research and Assessment, and provides a table showing relevant program data for the past five years including:

- i. number of degrees awarded,
- ii. number of undergraduate and graduate majors,
- iii. number of courses and sections taught,
- iv. average section size,
- v. FTES, FTEF, and SFR for lower division, upper division, undergraduate and graduate courses, and
- vi. ethnicity of majors and of faculty.

Included will be summaries of climate and advising or scheduling surveys, as well as information on recruitment activities and materials.

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 will also be included.

- d. **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.
- e. **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, the Library, Information Technology, etc.) shall be attached.
- f. **Requirements:** Justification for programs requiring more than the typical minimum number of units (180), (the larger number of units required for the baccalaureate degree) shall be included.

2. **Plan.** The Academic Program Review will describe plans for change and improvement in order to maintain leadership in the respective fields. 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 Outside Reviewer. After receiving the Outside Reviewer's Report, the program review committee shall either amend the draft plan to comply with the recommendations of the Outside Reviewer or explain why no amendment is necessary.

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

- a. **Curriculum.** What curricular changes do you envisage during the next five years? What developments are likely to cause you to change the curriculum? Discuss prospects and changes relevant to the Concord Campus. What changes are planned for General Education? Discuss any relevant changes to a multicultural learning experience.
- b. **Students.** Do you see the number of students majoring increasing or decreasing during the next five years? 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? How are advising and retention a priority for the program? Are changes needed in the program's learning goals? How will you assist students in attaining those goals during the next five years? What are your specific plans in the areas of curriculum change, outreach, scheduling and retention to increase student enrollment? 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?
- c. **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 PTR issues? Is advising shared fully by the faculty?
- d. **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 upon program priorities.

Elements of the preceding four areas (2a-d) 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 time line for completing the task.
- iii. Person(s) responsible for carrying out the needed change.
- iv. Anticipated cost.

**3. Outside Reviewer's Report.** To assist the review process, the Outside Reviewer will receive:

- a. a copy of the "Principles Regarding Faculty Participation in Tenure-Track Allocation Procedures" found in the Appendices of this document;
- b. the most recent five-year Academic Performance Review Statistics from Institutional Research;

- c. the Self-Study, including all attachments;
- d. the Plan;
- e. the Mission Statements of both the University and the Program;

It is also suggested that they be provided with the following (non-mandated):

- f. an annotated copy of the Student Learning Outcomes Rubric completed and scored by the department;
- g. an annotated copy of the Outside Reviewer's Rubric;
- h. a blank copy of the Outside Reviewer's Rubric;
- i. whatever other material the department wishes to send or the Outside Reviewer requests.

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

The Outside Reviewer's Report shall address the program's strengths as well as weaknesses, and offers 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 Outside Reviewer's Rubric is suggested to be attached to the report.

- 4. Program's Response.** Upon receiving the Outside Reviewer's Report, the faculty of the program will respond in writing. Recommendations, concerns and issues raised by the Outside Reviewer will be addressed in light of the Mission Statement, program need, the Plan, fiscal limitations and logistical issues.

The Program's Response to the Outside Reviewer's Report will be forwarded to CAPR by March 1 of the review year, along with the Self-Study, the Plan and the Outside Reviewer's Report (or those portions completed at this time.)

## C. **ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES**

For Programs *with* external accreditation

**Timeline for Academic Program Reviews *with* External Accreditation.** Programs that must complete an accreditation review will, as soon as possible thereafter, submit to CAPR evidence of the positive outcome of this review in order to be granted continuation status by CAPR. They are thus exempted from the reporting requirements contained in this document and instead are subject to the specific reporting as specified in “Contents of Academic Program Reviews” items 1-7. However, 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.

1. The program faculty shall forward all documents (See 1-7 below) to CAPR as soon as possible after completing the accreditation process. (Electronically is preferable; one copy, on paper or CD, shall be provided to the Senate Office.) The program chair 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 have approved the enclosed items and the date on which the approval was voted.
2. CAPR, following written guidelines and protocols in the Policies and Procedures for Committee Operations, will examine the Program’s documents and then meet with the Program Chair/Director, faculty, and others deemed appropriate.
3. CAPR shall write its final report to the Senate, utilizing a consistent format that includes the specific areas of the documents with supporting data. CAPR shall determine one of four possible recommendations for the program as set out in section B9 for non-accredited programs. Based on the review, CAPR may also make recommendations regarding allocation of resources, especially tenure-track faculty, for the program. CAPR’s final report for an outside accredited program will usually serve as an executive summary of the major findings of the program accreditation review. However, if the final report is unusually lengthy, an executive summary must also be written.
4. Following Senate approval of CAPR’s recommendations, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will meet with the Program Director, Department Chair(s), Dean, CAPR Chair, and other appropriate administrators, to discuss the program and recommendations for change during the next five years. At the close of the meeting the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will prepare a memorandum (MOU) identifying the agreed upon recommendations to be implemented, as well as the resources that will be provided to support the recommendations during the next accreditation period.
5. The Provost’s memorandum will be forwarded to the Department, College, CAPR, and the Chair of the Academic Senate.

### **Contents of Academic Program Reviews for Programs *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 particular field of instruction, along with a brief summary of the main findings of its outside accrediting body.

2. **Summary:** A brief memo summarizing the main program changes that have been made since the last review and those that are planned over the period until the next scheduled accreditation review.
3. **Curriculum and student learning:** A brief memo summarizing the program's learning outcome assessment procedures and any results derived from those procedures, Curricular Program statistics provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, and a discussion of recruitment, advising, retention, and growth potential.
4. **Faculty:** A brief memo outlining and justifying the program's sequence of expected tenure track faculty hiring needs for the period until the next accreditation review. A discussion of leadership and climate in the program, as well as workload and PTR concerns.
5. **Resources:** A brief memo listing and explaining any academic resource requirements (e.g. a new laboratory, facility, support-staff, etc.) needed for the effective functioning of the program and maintenance and improvement of the quality of teaching and research, if specified in the accreditation review.
6. For programs requiring more than the minimum (180) number of 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 180.
7. A copy of the outside accreditation review documentation and a copy of the guidelines, criteria or other requirements of the outside accrediting body.

**D. REQUESTS FOR DELAY or EXTENSION OF 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 may request an automatic date change on the Program Review Schedule to coincide with the receipt of the approved external accreditation. Requests for such changes are made to CAPR in writing through the Senate Office, with written approval from the Dean.
3. Programs *without* external accreditation requesting a full year extension (postponement) of their scheduled Academic Program Review (APR) 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 **end of Fall Quarter** 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 March 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 outside review during the Summer or Fall Quarter of the extension year, to occur as early as possible. CAPR will receive the completed program review no later than January 31<sup>st</sup> of the extension year.

**E. 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 submission *has not been received* by the Senate Office by the end of April, 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 program submission is *incomplete* at the end of April, CAPR will prepare a review document with the notation that the submission was not complete and that CAPR will not formally request continuance until those aspects of the submission are received. The CAPR members shall return all copies of the review materials received to the Academic Senate Office, for use by the CAPR members in the following year. These steps will advise the next CAPR of what needs to be done in the next year.

Tenure track requests will not be made without a current Five-Year Review that has been approved by the Academic Senate.

**F. Monitoring of the Program Review Process**

The Academic Senate Office will provide assistance to CAPR and the Departments/Colleges in tracking the 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 implementation of CAPR recommendations in said Program Review documents.

# **Planning and the Tenure Track Allocation Process**

Page number

## **II. ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT**

A. INTRODUCTION and Planning Discussions 13

B. Annual Report Format 14

## **III. FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN THE TENURE-TRACK ALLOCATION PROCESS**

Annual University Timeline 16

## **II. ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT**

### **A. INTRODUCTION and Planning Discussions**

Each program will provide a brief Annual Report (1 page of text, 1 page of assessment results and discussion as described below, and 1 page of statistics as provided by the Institutional Research through the Associate Dean) to be submitted to the College Dean and the Academic Senate Office (end of Winter Quarter). This Annual Report shall include updates of program (including curricular changes) and resource changes (including notations of faculty retirements and hiring, and faculty release time), program learning outcomes assessment activity prepared by the program, and other program performance data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. In addition, in years when requests are made for new tenure-track faculty hires, the report should include brief documentation of the outcome of faculty meetings in which decisions were made regarding new tenure-track faculty requests. This will include the outcome of votes supporting specific new requests and search information that could be of use to future search committees.

The Annual Report provides the basis for short-term 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 Report provides data for the Five-Year Review, and is especially useful to validate progress on CAPR recommendations; the Annual Report tracks tenure-track requests and the outcomes of those requests; and ensures 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 Report in the Senate Office. These Annual Reports will become part of the Five-Year Academic Program Review whether or not a program has outside accreditation.

The Annual Report is a valuable mechanism to hold departments and the administration jointly accountable for academic program quality and provide departments with the following benefits:

- Documentation of actions toward fulfilling their five year plans
- Documentation of administrative commitments made during the last program review and notations of follow through; this will allow the Senate Chair to assist the department in rectifying any lack of follow though
- Documentation of progress made toward CAPR recommendations or modifications of the program as an update to the Dean, the CAPR Chair and the Senate
- 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. New chairs will no longer be left in the situation of trying to create a five year review with little or no information from the prior years.

- 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; the basic data required for CAPR reports will already be in place
- The Annual Reports will be valuable to the outside reviewers
- Annual 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

### **Annual Report Timeline**

After consultation with the program faculty, the Program Chair/Director will submit the 3 page Annual Report to the College Dean at the end of Winter Quarter. These reports will reflect the plans and actions which form much of the basis for administrative allocation of resources to the program. A copy of the Annual Report will also be submitted electronically to the Senate Office no later than Spring Quarter and will be available to CAPR as additional information during the Program's Five-Year Review Process.

### **B. Annual Report Format**

Annual Reports shall consist of the three following parts:

1. A Brief Self Study
  2. Summary of Assessment Results
  3. Statistics obtained from Institutional Research through the Associate Dean
1. **A one-page self-study reporting 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. This document will indicate how the results of the program's assessment efforts support its conclusions and also record significant events which have occurred or are imminent, such as changes to resources, retirements, new hires, curricular changes, honors received, etc.  
 This report, approximately one page in length, will be developed during Winter Quarter by the Program Unit, discussed with appropriate administrators, and a copy kept on file in the Senate Office by program. 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.
  2. **A one-page summary of assessment results and ensuing or necessary revisions as noted in part A.** All programs must assess progress toward their goals in a way that provides evidence of the success of current efforts or of the need for change. The particular means of assessment must be tailored to the specific program. In general, this page will contain a reflection upon the information included in the annual statistical

support document and the assessment investigations taken by the program itself. Although not the sole component of program assessment, the planning process reflects student opinion; for example, through the use of student course evaluations, surveys of graduates, surveys of alumni, etc. Other components attempt to garner evidence of the effectiveness of the program. Whatever means a program chooses, assessment supports the program's planning efforts. The program unit will provide a one-page assessment report annually describing the evidence of the program's effectiveness to the appropriate Dean.

3. **A one-page report from Institutional Research through the Associate Dean showing numeric data summaries of the programs.**

The offices of Academic Resources, Institutional Research and Assessment, or Admissions and Enrollment Services, separately or in concert, as appropriate, produce an annual report in standard format. Delivered to the program, this report will be attached to the Annual Report of the unit. It shall include:

- For each department, degree, credential or certificate program as appropriate
  - a. number of graduates (SFWSp)
  - b. number of majors (SFWSp)
- For a minor, the number of degrees awarded with that minor noted
- Job or graduate school placement of graduates (insofar as this information is available from departmental records, Career Planning or University Relations)
- Ethnicity and gender (and comparable campus and system figures) of
  - a. majors and minors
  - b. faculty
  - c. support staff
- The number of faculty devoted to the program (both FTEF and number)
  - a. full time faculty by rank
  - b. part time faculty by rank
- Number of course sections offered – lower division, upper division, graduate
  - a. total enrollment – LD, UD G
  - b. average section size
  - c. average grade
  - d. student faculty ratio
  - e. summary student evaluations of faculty- LD, UD, G
- Staff support (clerical/technical person year PY) Financial Summary
  - a. student faculty ratio
  - b. dollars per FTES
  - c. dollars per FTEF
  - d. dollars per degree awarded

This statistical document is expected to be approximately one page long. The Annual Report may include one or two pages of supplemental information, as appendices, in the form of graphical presentation (e.g., line graphs), tables, and pertinent discussion which summarize the data of the last several (3-5) years to make changes and trends more apparent.

### III. FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN THE TENURE-TRACK ALLOCATION PROCESS

It is the intention of the Academic Senate that the assessment and planning expressed in the review process, presented in both the Annual and Five-Year Review Reports, be an integral part of the resource allocation process. In the years that requests are made, position requests should reflect deliberations of the faculty in the programs involved, as documented in Annual Reports.

The communication between administration and faculty governance as noted in the following timeline has been part of the shared governance process *in practice* since the timeline process was implemented.

#### **Annual University Timeline for Tenure Track Position Requests for Searches** (04-05 BEC 10, approved by the Senate for one year; CAPR approved the highlighted changes to this timeline)

##### **Starting Fall Quarter:**

Provost will meet with a joint session of the Executive Committee and the Committee on Budget and Resource Allocation (COBRA) and report on the past year's search successes. A brief analysis, which discusses separations, hires, carry-over searches, and percent tenure-track- to-lecturer ratio as a result of last year's efforts will be provided.

Deans and University Librarian will review with Chairs and Departments their needs for tenure track faculty. This process shall include but not be limited to an open and consultative examination of departmental Five-Year Reviews, CAPR/Senate recommendations, projected separation data, changes in programmatic needs, and analyses of the future demands of students and employers. An important part of the objective is to allow Departments to gain a good understanding of faculty needs and the academic goals of all units within the College. This should be considered as a preparation exercise for ensuring discussion on tenure track requests when first and second round position allocations are announced. As a basis for these discussions, a three page Annual Report of each program (whether or not requesting a tenure-track position) shall be prepared by the programs each Winter. (See Section III, Annual Program Planning)

The most recent CAPR Five-Year Review document and the subsequent Annual Reports will be used by the Dean when considering tenure track requests, which will give program faculty and Faculty Governance input into the process. Departments that cannot provide evidence of a successful CAPR Review within the past 6 years (or valid outside accreditation), as well as the Annual Reports for the years following the most recent CAPR review, may not submit requests for tenure track positions without a written exception granted by CAPR.

##### **Winter and Spring Quarters:**

March

Provost will prepare round one position allocations to Colleges and Library based upon a number of factors, e.g., fiscal analyses and separation data, available up to that point. Announcement of the round one allocations will be made following approval by the President. In a joint meeting with the Executive Committee and COBRA, the Provost will review the determination of the first round allocations.

### March-April

The College Deans and University Librarian will work with the faculty and Chairs or Directors to develop a prioritized list of tenure track position requests to be used in the first and second round faculty allocation requests. The newly prepared Program Annual Reports should inform this decision process.

### April

The College Deans and University Librarian will use the prioritized list to develop a recommendation package for submission to the Provost for the first round. Searches can be initiated immediately after review by Academic Affairs and approval by the President. Searches approved at this stage are subject to cancellation or postponement in the event of unforeseen budgetary circumstances.

### June-July

After analyzing the projected budget allocation from the CSU and other factors such as fiscal analyses and separation data, if it is found to be permitted by resources and warranted by needs, the Provost will meet with COBRA regarding this determination and then prepare and announce a second round of position allocations to the Colleges and Library following approval by the President.

### July

In consultation with the Departments and Chairs, the Deans and University Librarian will use the prioritized list and any relevant new information to develop a recommendation package for submission to the Provost for round two. Searches can be initiated immediately after review by Academic Affairs and approval by the President.

# APPENDICES

These appendices are provided as information to the process and are linked for the convenience of the University community.

If any of the appendices are requirements of the process, their approval date is noted.

The appendices are NOT subject to approval as part of this document.

## CHECKLISTS AND RUBRICS

This section is an appendix containing as many suggested checklists, rubrics, blank forms and sources of information as CAPR can identify. Each item is electronically linked when possible. Most forms and checklists will be downloadable for editing.

- A. Skeletal Review Timeline and Process Checklist for programs *without* external accreditation
- B. Skeletal Review Timeline and Process Checklist for programs *with* external accreditation
- C. Outside Reviewer Rubric
- D. Program Review Rubric
- E. Student Learning Outcomes Program Matrix
- F. CAPR Report Evaluation Response Form
- G. Principles Regarding Faculty Participation In the Tenure-Track Allocation Procedures  
(Revised CAPR Fall 2005)
- H. University Mission, Vision and Values Statement (Revised 04-05)
- I. CAPR Policies and Procedures for Committee Operations

**End of document, as submitted to the Senate.**