

ATTACHMENT to *POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR FIVE YEAR REVIEWS AND PLANS*:

Analysis of the Correlation between CAPR Policies and Procedures for Five Year Reviews and Plans and A Guide to Regular (Tenure-Track) Faculty Hiring at California State University, Hayward 2000-2005 (Committee A Report, 98-99 BEC 6)

This analysis is presented to clarify important differences and similarities in two documents that have bearing on the hiring process of regular (tenure-track; TT) faculty at CSUH. Because both documents address this important issue, it seems germane to analyze potential overlap or conflict in the two documents with the goal of providing some insight into how both documents may be used in the faculty allocation process. The impetus for this analysis stems from discussions at CAPR in 2000-2001 concerning how these documents are related and how each document should be used in the allocation of new TT faculty.

Background

The first document, *A Guide to Regular (Tenure-Track) Faculty Hiring at California State University, Hayward, 2000-2005* (referred to here as the **Committee A Report**), was prepared in accordance with Academic Senate Resolution 98-99 BEC 6, Faculty Participation in the Tenure-Track Allocation Process, which called for the creation of a committee of faculty and administrators to develop a multi-year guide for tenure-track faculty hiring. The Committee A Report was prepared by a committee of regular faculty and administrators in 1999-2000 and provides several principles and recommendations that are to be considered in the TT allocation process. This document speaks directly to the issue of TT hiring at CSUH. BEC 6 seeks to provide a procedure for faculty input into this process. It does not directly mention the role of the CAPR 5-Year Review in the eleven specified principles.

The second document, *Policies and Procedures for Five Year Reviews and Plans* (referred to here as the **5-Year Review**) is intended as a guide for academic Program Review, a requirement of the Board of Trustees of the CSU that is to occur approximately every five years. The preface of the 5-Year Review states that, "It is incumbent upon the Schools to utilize Program Review as an instrument of planning from which emerge criteria for resource allocation, including new Tenure-Track faculty hires." Whereas the Committee A Report addresses directly the issue of TT hiring, with recommendations to be followed with respect to hiring, the 5-Year Review addresses this issue only indirectly, and in the context of overall program planning, assessment and resource allocation. CAPR may report a status of "Noncompliance" for any program that fails to conduct a 5-Year Review, and recommend to the Academic Senate withholding resources (including new TT positions), but the decision to follow that recommendation ultimately lies with the President. In general, the 5-Year Review document is a guide by which departments and programs review how previous plans were carried out and how goals were met, and how future plans and goals will be achieved over a five-year span. An important component of this planning process is the role of new faculty hires in achieving departmental goals.

Analysis

Similarities:

The Committee A Report provides 11 ‘principles’ (not numbered in the text) that provide a framework for the new faculty allocation process. Under each principle, two recommendations are provided; one recommendation is directed toward departments and schools, whereas the second recommendation is directed toward the President. The two recommendations are linked by the principle under consideration. For example, principle 1, and to a large extent Principles 4 and 5, state that new faculty hiring must consider the University’s enrollment patterns, trends and growth projections. The recommendation for schools and departments is that requests for new faculty positions should indicate relevant enrollment figures and meaningful enrollment projections; the recommendation for the President is that the closest attention be paid to opportunities for sustained and new student enrollment for the University. The Self-Study Component of the 5-Year Review (Document #1 of the 5-Year Review) proposes that each program utilize Academic Program Performance Statistics provided annually by Institutional Research and Analysis. Presumably, enrollment projections referred to in the Committee A will be obtained from Institutional Research, although this is not made clear. However, it is clear there is a direct link between the Committee A Report and the 5-Year Review document with regard to the use of program statistics, enrollment projections and new faculty hires.

Included in the Self-Study portion of the 5-Year Review are statements as to the relationship between program quality (Principle 10 of the Committee A Report) and enrollment trends, S/F ratios, percentage of courses taught by regular TT faculty, and the number of majors. The concept of program ‘quality’ within the 5-Year Report may also be directly linked to the concept of ‘high growth’ and ‘prestige’ programs with respect to new faculty hires referred to in the Committee A Report. Although it is unclear what constitutes a ‘prestige’ program, the underlying message in this portion of the Committee A Report is that new faculty hiring consideration should include those programs that maintain high quality, but may not experience high growth; these high quality ‘prestige’ programs contribute to the overall educational goals of undergraduate and graduate instruction at CSUH and should receive due consideration in the faculty hiring process.

Differences:

The two documents also differ in some important areas. For example, the Committee A Report does not address the issue of Outcomes Assessment, but Assessment is an integral feature of the 5-Year Review in both the Self-Study and Planning components of that document. Clearly, no high quality program will exist without an adequate and forward-thinking Assessment Plan. The Five-Year Review document does not explicitly address the issue of General Education or Teacher Training, which are addressed as Principles 6 and 7, respectively, in the Committee A Report.

Finally, a required, and very important, component of the 5-Year Review is the Outside Reviewer’s Report (Document #3) and the Program’s Response (Document #4). CAPR

considers this to be a crucial factor in its assessment of each program and in making its recommendation to the Academic Senate. The Outside Reviewer's Report addresses the program's strengths and weaknesses and offers suggestions for program improvement, fulfillment of its mission and enhancement of its position with respect to system-wide and

national trends. In essence, the Outside Reviewer serves as an independent "quality control" expert, and each program shall address the issues raised by the Reviewer. The issue of independent "quality control" is not addressed in the Committee A Report, which instead speaks directly to the concepts of "prestige" and overall program quality.

Perspectives

The Committee A Report and the 5-Year Review are documents with different purposes. Although they use different language, both address the issue of TT hires and have considerable overlap on this issue. The Committee A Report is intended to be a *Guide* to regular (TT) hiring. However it is couched in relatively vague language and does not make explicit suggestions as to the role of faculty in the TT hiring process. The 11 principles are not prioritized and it is uncertain how they are weighted in making hiring decisions. As such, its use as a guide in this process is somewhat unclear. However, a strength of the Report is that several general principles have emerged from which decisions about the hiring of TT faculty may be considered. The Five-Year Review document, for its role, is a guide to writing and submitting a Program Review, with hiring of TT faculty playing an integral role in the planning aspect of each program. The issue of TT hiring is but one aspect of the overall Program Review document and the Five-Year Review document is not intended to provide instruction on how TT hiring decisions are to be made.