

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY**

DESIGNATION CODE: **2008-09 CAPR 23** revised

DATE SUBMITTED: April 23, 2009

**TO:** The Academic Senate

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

**SUBJECT:** Revisions to the 5-Year Program Review Process

**PURPOSE:** For Action by the Academic Senate

**ACTION REQUESTED:** That the Academic Senate approve the attached revision to the 5-year Program Review Process, superceding 05-06 CAPR 9; effective Fall 09

**Background**

**Information:** In 2007-2008, CAPR submitted 07-08 CAPR 21 to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate proposing revisions to 05-06 CAPR 9. The Executive Committee referred these materials back to CAPR for more extensive work. During 08-09 CAPR has reviewed and modified all documents and appendices related to the 5-Year Program Review Process and unanimously approved the new document at its meeting on April 16<sup>th</sup>.

Due to the substantial modification of the policy, it is not feasible to provide track changes to the Senate. However the major modifications are summarized below:

**Summary of Modifications**

- The program is now required to provide a summary document. This summary will be used for the CAPR document Background Information summary to the Senate, which will prevent erroneous information within the CAPR document.
- The timeline has been substantially modified, so that the entire review process is accomplished during one academic year (rather than within part of an academic year) and submitted electronically in sections throughout the year. At the end of the academic year (May 15<sup>th</sup>) the entire review submission is printed and 2 copies are provided to the Senate Office. The CAPR interview will take place during the following academic year, so that conversations are not pressured by lack of time and deadlines.
- More guidance is provided to programs on the expectations of the submissions to CAPR, with a suggested Table of Contents and templates for a cover page and submission content areas, which will allow uniformity of structure so that everyone can find information within the reports more easily.
- Program data requirements are modified so that the same types of data are expected (and will be provided in accessible format) in the annual and five-year reviews.
- Suggested rubrics are provided for assessing program SLO's (by the program) and for grading the program (by the outside reviewer).
- The requirements have been simplified and clarified, where possible.

**Revisions on the floor of the Academic Senate are highlighted in yellow; approved as amended on 5-19-09.**

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES  
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>I.</b>	<b>ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES</b>	
	A. Introduction.....	2
	B. Academic Program Review Procedures and Timeline for Programs <i>without</i> External Accreditation.....	3
	C. Academic Program Review Procedures and Timeline for Programs <i>with</i> External Accreditation.....	8
	D. Requests for Delay or Extension of Academic Program Reviews.....	10
	E. Missing or Incomplete Submissions.....	10
	F. Monitoring of the Program Review Process.....	10
<b>II.</b>	<b>Annual Program Report.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>Faculty Participation in the Tenure-Track Allocation Process.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>Submission Expectations for Five-Year Program Reviews</b>	
	A. Cover-Sheet Template for Five-Year Program Reviews.....	16
	B. Table of Contents Template.....	17
	C. Submission Content for Table of Content Areas.....	18
<b>V.</b>	<b>Suggested Scaled Rubric for Grading the Program’s Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>Required CAPR Five-Year Review Data.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>CAPR Format for Response to Five-Year Program Reviews.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<del><b>VIII.</b></del>	<del><b>Suggested Scaled Rubric for Grading the Program (to be used by Outside Reviewer).....</b></del>	<del><b>26</b></del>

# 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 submit a report including its recommendations regarding the program, and the Summary provided in the Program's Five-Year Review Self-Study (see IV. Submission Expectations for Five-Year Program Reviews).

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 (or designee), and other appropriate administrators and faculty, to discuss the program and recommendations for change. At the close of the meeting the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the Dean, will prepare a memorandum of understanding (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 Five (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 use 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 such as the Library and computing services. The Program Review Schedule will be updated annually and posted on the Academic Senate website.

In addition, CAPR will provide support to academic programs undergoing review. This will include the provision of a workshop or workshops on the requirements, the timelines, the 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.

## **B. ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAMS *WITHOUT* EXTERNAL ACCREDITATION**

1. The program faculty shall forward all final documents to the Senate Office by May 15 of the review year. The program Chair or director/coordinator shall be responsible for ensuring the completion of the program review. The title page of the program review document (see IV. A. Cover Sheet Template for Five-Year Program Review) shall verify that the program faculty has approved the Self-Study and the (Amended) Five-Year Plan and will note the date of approval. The results of the faculty vote shall also be noted.
2. 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.
3. CAPR shall write its final report to the Senate, using a consistent format (see VII. CAPR Format for Response to Five-Year Program Reviews) to provide its recommendations. CAPR shall determine one of four possible recommendations for the program:
  - a) Continuation *without* modification (this may include continuation without modification, but include implementation of the recommendations specifically identified by CAPR and later 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, either through the annual reports or 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, either through the annual reports or on a timeline to be specified by CAPR;
  - 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 its final response the Executive Summary from the Program's Self-Study.

4. 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 (or designee), and other appropriate administrators and faculty to discuss the program and recommendations for the next five years. At the close of the meeting, the

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee), in consultation with the Dean, 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.

5. The Provost will forward the memorandum to the Department, College, CAPR, and the Chair of the Academic Senate, and the Office of the Academic Senate.

**Contents of Academic Program Reviews for Programs *without* external accreditation.** The Five-Year Review document shall be formatted according to the procedures in I.C. (Academic Program Review Procedures for Programs With External Accreditation).

1. **Summary.** This shall summarize in no more than five (5) pages the entire report, including all the items listed in Section IV.
2. **Self-Study.** Each program shall use the Academic Performance Review Statistics from Planning and Institutional Research (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:
  - 2.1. **Summary of Previous Review and Plan.** 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.
  - 2.2. **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. Include online and hybrid learning.

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. Face-to-face, hybrid, and online offerings should be included.

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 on the three campuses (Hayward, Concord, and Online), the Oakland Professional Center, and other venues. In addition, there should be a discussion of the program's multi-cultural learning activities, if relevant.
  - 2.3. **Students and faculty:** This document uses the Academic Performance Review Statistics available from Planning and Institutional Research, and provides a table (see section VI. Required CAPR Five-Year Review Data for more information) showing relevant program data for the past five years including:
    - a) **Student demographics of majors, minors, and options**
    - b) **Student level of majors, minors, and options**
    - c) **Faculty and academic allocation**
    - d) **Course data**

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 must also be included. The following questions, as applicable, should be considered as a baseline for the data discussion. Other commentary is welcome.

- 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).
  - Similarly, 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).
  - 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).
  - Discuss the distribution of the program's teaching resources in lower and upper division courses and the implications of this distribution on program(s).
  - 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).
  - 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).
  - Similarly, 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).
  - 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 dovetails with programs at Hayward, Online, or other venues; and the impact of the programs/courses.
  - Similarly, 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.
  - Discuss other data elements as appropriate to the program(s).
- 2.4. 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.
- 2.5. 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, etc.) shall be attached.
- 2.6. 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.
- 3. 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):

- 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.
- 3.2. Students.** 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? How are advising and retention studied and supported for students in 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?
- 3.3. 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?
- 3.4. 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.

Elements of the preceding four areas (3.1 – 3.4) 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.
- 4. 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” (see section III);
  - b) the most recent five-year Academic Performance Review Statistics from Planning and Institutional Research.
  - 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) a copy of the Student Learning Outcomes rubric;
  - h) a blank copy of the Outside Reviewer’s rubric; and
  - i) any additional documents the program deems helpful.

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 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 Outside Reviewer's Rubric should be attached to the report.

5. **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 electronically (and two hard copies of the entire Five-Year Program Review with copies of all of the Annual Reports submitted since the prior Five-Year Program Review) to the Senate Office by May 15 of the review year, along with the Self-Study, the Plan (as amended following the Outside 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.

#### **5-Year Review Submission Timeline for programs *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
- ☑ **September:** prior to the start of Fall Quarter: Notification of 5 Year Review is sent to Program Chairs by the Senate Office and cc to the Dean.
- ☑ **Fall Quarter:** Review committee is chosen by program faculty, which will assume responsibility for the preparation of the Self-Study and Five-Year Plan
- ☑ **November:** Postponement requests, with full justification, are due *no later than the first CAPR meeting of November* and must be signed by the Dean. Program representation **MUST** attend the meeting to answer CAPR questions regarding the request.
- ☑ **End of Fall:** Electronic submission deadline for the Self-Study and Five-Year Plan and designation of the External Reviewer(s)
- ☑ **Winter Quarter:** Early in the quarter 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 will be received prior to the end of Winter Quarter.
- ☑ **End of Winter Quarter:** 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 at the end of Winter Quarter.
- ☑ **Early Spring Quarter:** 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.
- ☑ **May 15<sup>th</sup> (or before):** the Response to the Reviewer's Report and Revised plan are due in electronic format to the Senate Office on May 15<sup>th</sup> . **Two hard copies 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 May 15<sup>th</sup>.

- ☑ The Provost and College Dean will be notified if a submission is not received by the deadline.
- ☑ In the Fall Quarter of the following year, CAPR will set a meeting date for program representatives to meet with CAPR to discuss the review submission. These meetings continue as needed throughout the Fall and Winter Quarters. 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.

### **C. ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAMS WITH EXTERNAL ACCREDITATION**

Programs that must complete an accreditation 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 Section I.B. of this document and instead are subject to the specific reporting as specified below (items 1-5). 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.

#### **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. **Submission Summary.** This shall summarize in no more than five (5) pages the entire report, including items 3-5 below.
3. **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. In forming this plan, the program shall address the following four areas (these questions provide guidelines):
  - a) **Summary of Program Changes.** 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.
  - b) **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 Planning and Institutional Review, and a discussion of recruitment, advising, retention, and growth potential.
  - c) **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.

Include a discussion of leadership and climate in the program, as well as workload and PTR concerns.

- d) **Resources.** A brief memo listing and explaining any academic resource requirements (e.g., library, information technology, assistive technology, instructional support, facilities, etc.) needed for the effective functioning of the program and maintenance and improvement of the quality of teaching and research, as specified in the accreditation review or required to meet CSU or CSUEB standards.
4. 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.
5. A copy of the outside accreditation review documentation and a copy of the guidelines, criteria or other requirements of the outside accrediting body.

### **Five-Year Review Submission Timeline for programs *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/Assoc Deans, and the Provost/Assoc Provost
- September: prior to the start of Fall Quarter: 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 gather 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 following quarter 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 2 hard copies of the required materials and one hard copy of the accreditation submission.
- CAPR will set a meeting date 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.

#### **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 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 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 **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 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's External Reviewer's Report *has not been received* by the Senate Office by the end of Winter quarter, 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 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 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 considered 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.

## 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 Planning and Institutional Research through the Associate Vice President to be submitted to the College Dean and electronically to the Associate Vice President, Academic Programs & Grad Studies (designee for the Provost's copy) and to 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 Planning and Institutional Research. 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 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 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. At the same time, a copy of the Annual Report will also be submitted electronically to the Associate Vice President, Academic Programs & Graduate Studies, and the Senate Office Coordinator 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 Planning and 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 Planning and Institutional Research through the Associate Dean showing numeric data summaries of the programs.**

The offices of Academic Resources, and Planning and Institutional Research, 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:

- a) Student demographics of majors, minors, and options
- b) Student level of majors, minors, and options
- c) Faculty and academic allocation
- d) Course data

This statistical document is expected to be approximately one page long and will contain the same data as required for the five-year review (see section VI. Required CAPR Five-Year Review Data). 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**

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 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:**

- 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.

A. Following our Mission, Vision, and Values. Constructed through negotiation and consensus building, we refer to our Mission, Vision, and Values statement as our planning framework.

**PRINCIPLE 2:** University-wide and department plans for faculty hiring must be formulated in accordance with the University's Mission, Vision, and Values statements ([linked here](#)).

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 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 serious consideration to requests that show significant promise of helping the University and the Departments meet their missions.
- 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.

**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:**

- Departments and colleges seeking to replace lecturers with tenure-track hires should show how such hires will improve the unit's quality and advance the unit's and the University's goals and obligations in general education. These requests should explain how the new teaching arrangements will obviate the need for lecturers. 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:**

- 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.

**B. Role of Assessment in Faculty Hiring. Each degree program assesses student mastery of outcomes that are considered essential to all graduates in that major. The faculty then use the data to assess the effectiveness of their current curriculum in preparing the students to master the outcomes.**

**If the data demonstrate that students fail to master certain outcomes due to the lack of sufficient curriculum, the lack of faculty expertise to offer the curriculum, the lack of sufficient faculty to offer the courses on a regular basis, or if the faculty have to assume an uncompensated overload, in order to support the student's achievement of outcomes, then the assessment data can be used to support the request for a new position.**

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- 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: Preparing a new generation of well-prepared teachers is one of the University's major responsibilities to the citizens and State of California.**

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- In developing plans and requests for tenure-track hiring departments and colleges should, where appropriate, consider how they can best contribute to teacher preparation and educational reform in general. Colleges and departments that participate in subject-matter preparation and teacher education programs and in the Liberal Studies major should make their involvement clear when requesting new tenure-track hires, and, where appropriate, show how the new hires will strengthen that involvement.
- The President should give serious consideration to requests for tenure-track hiring that will advance the University's ability to prepare a greater number of better trained teachers, especially in shortage areas.

**PRINCIPLE 7: Preparing a new generation of well-trained nurses is one of the University's major responsibilities to the citizens and State of California.**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

- The President/Provost should give serious consideration to requests for tenure-track hiring that will advance the University's ability to prepare a greater number of nurses to help reduce California's nursing shortage.

**PRINCIPLE 8: 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:**

- 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 9: 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:**

- 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 10: 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:**

- 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 skills.

<b>IV. Submission Expectations for Five-Year Program Reviews</b>
--

<b>A. Cover-Sheet Template for Five-Year Program Review</b>
---

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.]

## IV. Submission Expectations for Five-Year Program Reviews

### B. Table of Contents Template

#### Table of Contents

1. Summary of the program [max. 5 pages] .....	??
2. Self-Study .....	??
2.1. Summary of Previous Review and Plan .....	??
2.2. Curriculum and Student Learning .....	??
2.3. Students, Advising, and Retention .....	??
2.4. Faculty .....	??
2.5. Resources .....	??
2.6. Units Requirement .....	??
3. Five-Year Plan .....	??
3.1. Curriculum .....	??
3.2. Students .....	??
3.3. Faculty .....	??
3.4. Other Resources .....	??
4. Outside Reviewer(s)' Report .....	??
5. Program Response to Outside Reviewer(s)' Report .....	??
Appendices .....	??
A .....	??
B .....	??
C .....	??
etc.	

## **IV. Submission Expectations for Five-Year Program Reviews**

### **C. Submission Content for Table of Content Areas**

(NOTE: CAPR encourages programs to be as efficient as possible in providing the information requested in this outline.)

#### **1. Summary of the Program [max. 5 pages]**

The outline should be used as a guide to writing the Summary  
All items (1-4) should be summarized.

#### **2. Self-Study**

##### **2.1. Summary of Previous Review and 5-Year Plan**

- previous plan summary
- progress in implementing the previous Plan, what remains to be completed, other achievements (other program achievements, faculty professional achievements, and student achievements). Give a brief summary here, and attach details, if any, as appendix)

##### **2.2. Curriculum and Student Learning**

- Student learning outcomes assessment plan, implementation, summary results, and measures to improve the program based on assessment (see *V. Scaled Rubric for Grading the Program's SLO Assessment Plan*)
- The program's course offerings, and how they compare to comparable CSU programs, and nationally recognized programs
- If offering G.E. courses, provide summary data for student learning outcomes, and discuss offerings at Concord and online, and issues concerning multi-cultural learning (if relevant)

##### **2.3. Students, Advising, and Retention**

- Using Academic Performance Review Statistics from Planning and Institutional Research, provide a table showing
  - Student Demographics
  - Student Level
  - Faculty and Academic Allocation
  - Course Data
- Summary of climate, advising, scheduling, recruitment
- Analysis of enrollment (FTES & majors) trends, SFR, % of courses/FTES taught by regular faculty, other relevant information
- Discussion of the impact of these statistics on the program and its quality

##### **2.4. Faculty**

- list and descriptions of tenure track positions requested since last review,
- report progress in achieving these requests

##### **2.5. Resources**

- Library
- Information/Instructional Technology
- Assistive Technology
- Any other resource needs relevant to the program

##### **2.6. Units Requirement**

- State that 180 units are required. If more than 180 units are required, give justifications.

### **3. Five-Year Plan**

This is the plan for the next 5 years. For each of the following 4 areas, include 1) action/change, 2) timeline, 3) person(s) in charge, & 4) estimated cost.

#### **3.1. Curriculum**

- Envisioned changes for the next five years, addressing recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study, from external reviewer(s), and from assessment; issues relating to Concord, online offerings, G.E., and multicultural learning

#### **3.2. Students**

- Envisioned changes of trends for the next five years, addressing recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study, from external reviewer(s), and from assessment, including, but not limited to the following issues:
  - Number of majors
  - Total enrollments
  - Student characteristics
  - Student career opportunities
  - Program-level student learning outcomes
  - Outreach plans
  - Advising and retention strategies
  - Class scheduling
  - New or changes programs
  - Resources to support student learning

#### **3.3. Faculty**

- Envisioned changes for the next five years, addressing recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study, from external reviewer(s), and from assessment
- List and justify anticipated new tenure-track applications
- Climate issues, leadership-faculty communication, workload and PT&R challenges, advising plans

#### **3.4. Other Resources**

- discuss envisioned changes for the next five years, addressing recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study, including lessons from assessment, including, but not limited to the following:
  - Staff
  - Equipment
  - Library
  - Travel funds
  - Information/instructional technology; assistive technology
  - Other resource needs

### **4. Outside Reviewer(s)' Report**

### **5. Program Response to Outside Reviewer's Report**

#### **Appendices**

Examples might include the following:

- a) Program/course assessment plans that illustrate your self-study report
- b) Details on program requirements, as appropriate
- c) List of current course offerings
- d) Statistical data that is referenced in the self-study
- e) Statements from resource providers, e.g., library liaison, IT, facilities
- f) Documentation about faculty output, e.g., resumes, list of publications, etc.

**V. Suggested Scaled Rubric for Grading the Program’s Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan**

		<b>Excellent (points earned to left of description)</b>	<b>Adequate (points earned to left of description)</b>	<b>Weak (points earned to left of description)</b>	<b>Absent (points earned to left of description)</b>	<b>Pts Earn</b>	<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Section 1: Program Mission, Goals and Objectives</b>								
<b>1. Assessment Plan</b>	<b>3</b>	The Plan very clearly states the Department’s program mission in terms of educational purpose and goals.	<b>2</b>	The Plan states the Department’s program mission in terms of educational purpose and goals, though occasionally vague.	<b>1</b>	The Plan states the Department’s program mission in terms of educational purpose and goals, though the statement is generally vague and lacking in clarity.	<b>0</b>	The Plan does not give the Department’s program mission in terms of educational purpose or goals.
	<b>3</b>	Program-level student learning objectives are stated in measurable or observable terms, indicating what students will be able to do/and to what changes in knowledge, attitudes or behaviors will occur as a result of the program.	<b>2</b>	Program-level student learning objectives are stated, only some are stated in measurable or observable terms, indicating what students will be able to do/and to what changes in knowledge, attitudes or behaviors will occur as a result of the program.	<b>1</b>	Program-level student learning objectives are stated but not in measurable or observable terms, that indicate what students will be able to do/and to what changes in knowledge, attitudes or behaviors will occur as a result of the program.	<b>0</b>	No program level student learning objectives are state in the Plan.
<b>Developing and Implementing Assessment Methods</b>								

	<b>Excellent (points earned to left of description)</b>	<b>Adequate (points earned to left of description)</b>	<b>Weak (points earned to left of description)</b>	<b>Absent (points earned to left of description)</b>	<b>Pts Earn</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>3. Measurement</b>	<b>3</b> Specific clear descriptions of appropriate methods and strategies to be used to determine students achievement of the student-centered learning objectives at the program level. These are consistently linked with specific program level student learning objectives.	<b>2</b> Specific clear descriptions of appropriate methods and strategies to be used to determine students achievement of the student-centered learning objectives at the program level. But these are not consistently linked with specific program level student learning objectives.	<b>1</b> Specific clear descriptions of methods and strategies to be used to determine students achievement of the student-centered learning objectives at the program level. But these methods are clearly inappropriate.	<b>0</b> Specific methods and strategies to be used to determine students achievement of the student-centered learning objectives at the program level are named. But are not described enough to ascertain their appropriateness for the task.		
<b>4. Course Level SLOs</b>	<b>3</b> Student-centered learning objectives at the course level are consistently linked with specific program level student learning objectives. The methods described are illustrated by specific strategies and methods in course syllabi.	<b>2</b> Student-centered learning objectives at the course level are inconsistently linked with specific program level student learning objectives. The methods described are illustrated by specific strategies and methods in course syllabi.	<b>1</b> Student-centered learning objectives at the course level are illustrated by specific strategies and methods in course syllabi. However, methods are clearly inappropriate for the desired assessment.	<b>0</b> Student-centered learning objectives at the course level are named. However, methods are not described clearly enough to ascertain appropriateness for the assessment task.		

	<b>Excellent (points earned to left of description)</b>	<b>Adequate (points earned to left of description)</b>	<b>Weak (points earned to left of description)</b>	<b>Absent (points earned to left of description)</b>	<b>Pts Earn</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>5. Assessment Results</b>	<b>3</b> Summary results of actual assessment activities completed by the program are presented. This summary shows the results (using narrative, qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods) from surveys, exams or other direct measures of student learning outcomes.	<b>2</b> Summary results of actual assessment activities completed by the program are presented. This summary shows the results (using narrative, qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods) from surveys, exams or other direct measures of student learning outcomes.	<b>1</b> No assessment results of actual student learning outcomes data are presented.	<b>0</b> No assessment results of actual student learning outcomes data are presented.		
	<b>Using Assessment Results</b>					
<b>6. Analysis of Results</b>	<b>3</b> Logical, well-reasoned analysis of the results and conclusions of intended and unintended student learning outcomes is clearly presented and supported by the presented data.	<b>2</b> Logical, well-reasoned analysis of the results and conclusions of intended and unintended student learning outcomes is presented and but only partially supported by the presented data.	<b>1</b> Logical, well-reasoned analysis of the results and conclusions of intended and unintended student learning outcomes is presented but is not supported by the presented data.	<b>0</b> No conclusion or analysis of the data related to student learning outcomes is presented.		

	<b>Excellent (points earned to left of description)</b>	<b>Adequate (points earned to left of description)</b>	<b>Weak (points earned to left of description)</b>	<b>Absent (points earned to left of description)</b>	<b>Pts Earn</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>7. Use of Results for Improvement</b>	<b>3</b> Explicit description of how the results will be /have been used in academic planning process of the program, including curricular, instructional and/or strategic planning and implementation (e.g. program or course modifications, faculty development, advisement, or need for additional assessment data).	<b>2</b> Implicit description of how the results will be /have been used in academic planning process of the program, including curricular, instructional and/or strategic planning and implementation (e.g. program or course modifications, faculty development, advisement, or need for additional assessment data).	<b>1</b> No apparent description of how the results will be /have been used in academic planning process of the program, are presented, however some indication that program has complete such activities.	<b>0</b> No description offered of how the will be/have been used in academic planning process of the program.		
<b>Total score (of a possible 28 points)</b>						
<b>Average score for item (=Total/7 items)</b>						

## **VI. Required CAPR Five-Year Review Data**

### **a) Student demographics of majors, minors, and options:**

- number and % of undergraduates and graduates by ethnicity and sex
- number and % of certificate students by ethnicity and sex (if applicable)
- number and % of first-time freshmen by ethnicity and sex
- number and % of new transfer students by ethnicity and sex

### **b) Student level of majors, minors, and options :**

- headcount of undergraduates, graduates, and certificate students (if applicable)
- number and % of part-time undergraduates, graduates, and certificate students (if applicable)
- number and % of full-time undergraduates, graduates, and certificate students (if applicable)
- SCU's of undergraduates, graduates, and certificate students (if applicable)
- FTES of undergraduates, graduates, and certificate students (if applicable)

### **c) Faculty & academic allocation**

- headcount and % of total of full-time faculty and part-time faculty
- headcount and % of total of tenure-track and lecturer faculty
- number of FTF
- SFR of tenure-track faculty, lecturer faculty, and total faculty

### **d) Course data**

- Number of classes, % of total classes, and average class size of lower division and upper division courses taught by tenure track faculty
- Number of classes, % of total classes, and average class size of lower division and upper division courses taught by lecturers
- Number of classes and average class size of all courses

## VII. CAPR Format for Response to Five-Year Program Reviews

### 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]

#### CAPR Analysis of the Program's Five-Year Review

- Program
  - 1.
  - 2.
  - 3.
- Resources
  - 1.
  - 2.
  - 3.

CAPR Recommendation(s) for Continuation of the Program

Date of the Program's Next Five-Year Review

**VIII. Suggested Scaled Rubric for Grading the Program — to be used by outside reviewer**

Excellent (points earned to left of description)	Adequate (points earned to left of description)	Weak (points earned to left of description)	Absent (points earned to left of description)	Pts	Comment
<b>Section 1: Self Study of the Program</b>					
As an expert in the field, considering programs at comparable institutions,					
4 ...the program has chosen directions that are generally consistent.	3 ...the program has chosen directions that are generally consistent, although there are some differences in direction.	2 ...this program has chosen directions that are generally consistent, but there is a lack of clarity of vision.	1 ...this program has chosen directions that are inconsistent.		
As an expert in the field, reviewing the requests for new hires,					
4 ...the proposed new hires are relevant to standard needs or changes in the field and are very consistent with the overall direction of the field.	3 ... the proposed new hires are relevant to standard needs or changes in the field and are consistent with the overall direction of the field.	2 ... the proposed new hires are relevant to standard needs or changes in the field and are consistent with the overall direction of the field. However, they are over/under ambitious for the program.	1 ... the proposed new hires are relevant to standard needs or changes in the field and are not consistent with the overall direction of the field.		
The outcomes and their assessment mechanisms					
4 ...are reasonable for the field and the program, the outcomes are related to the goals throughout the program, and the goals and outcomes are related clearly.	3 ...are reasonable for the field and the program, the outcomes are generally related to the goals of the program, and the goals and outcomes are related with some clarity.	2 ...are described, but are generally lacking vision or appropriateness given the field or the program.	1 ...are not clear or are inappropriate for the field/program.		
The statistics and trends in the report, compared to other programs,					
4 ...are better than expected.	3 ...are appropriate.	2 ...are somewhat similar.	1 ...are inappropriate.		
The curricular requirements of the program,					
4 ...are well aligned with similar programs and reasonable for the	3 ...are appropriate in comparison to similar programs and reasonable for the	2 ...are only somewhat aligned with similar programs.	1 ...are not aligned with similar programs.		

	field.		field.				
	The curricular requirements of the program						
4	...are more than adequate to meet the goals of the program.	3	...are adequate to meet the goals of the program.	2	...need some improvement to meet the goals of the program.	1	...are inadequate to meet the goals of the program.
<b>Program Plan/Academic Plan</b>							
	The proposed curricular changes, if any,						
4	...are reasonable for the field, appropriate for the program, and linked to program objectives	3	...fall short in one area	2	...fall short in two areas	1	...are not appropriate
	Given the national and regional trends in the field, it is anticipated that student growth will						
4	...increase dramatically in the next five years.	3	...increase slightly in the next five years.	2	...remain flat/stable in the next five years.	1	...decrease in the next five years.
	Considering the overall plan and its quality, potential for benefiting the program, and likelihood of completion, if resources are allocated to this plan, it is						
4	...very likely to be successful.	3	...likely to be successful.	2	...could succeed at a later time.	1	...unlikely to be successful.
<b>Curriculum</b>							
	Considering the curriculum, the students						
4	...are exposed to an admirable breadth and depth of study in the field, including appropriate interdisciplinary coursework.	3	...are exposed to an adequate breadth and depth of study in the field, including appropriate interdisciplinary coursework.	2	...need to be exposed to more breadth and depth of study in the field, including appropriate interdisciplinary coursework.	1	...are not exposed to an adequate breadth and depth of study in the field, including appropriate interdisciplinary coursework.
<b>Resources</b>							
	Considering the number of tenure-track faculty and comparing that number to programs of similar size,						
4	...the current complement is adequate.	3	...the current complement is nearly adequate, considering adjunct faculty.	2	...the current complement is inadequate by one tenure-track position.	1	...the current complement is inadequate by two or more tenure-track positions.

**Narrative:**

The report of the Outside Reviewer should address any areas where improvement might be implemented, as noted above, particularly for items with ratings of 3 or lower, or where discussion is necessary. Ideas for improvement are welcomed, as are areas worthy of praise. Please be sure to support the ratings and review. Cite specific examples or data.