



ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

*History: 05-06 CAPR 9
08-09 CAPR 23 rev; approved as amended on May 19, 2009
Revised by 2010-11 CAPR 4 and 2010-11 CAPR 14
Revised by 11-12 CAPR 9
Revised by 12-13 CAPR 5
Revised by 13-14 CAPR 10; President approved 12/4/14
Revised by 15-16 CAPR 8; Senate approved 5/17/16; President approved 5/31/16
16-17 CAPR 5 amended; Senate approved 5/30/17; President approved 6/6/17*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES.....3
A. Introduction.....3
B. Annual Program Report.....4
C. Five-Year Academic Program Review Procedures For Programs.....7
D. Contents of Five-Year Academic Program Reviews For Programs Without External Accreditation.....8
E. Five-Year Academic Program Review For Programs With External Accreditation.....13
F. Requests for Delay or Extension of Academic Program Reviews.....15
G. Missing or Incomplete Submissions.....15
H. Monitoring of the Program Review Process.....16
II. FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN THE TENURE-TRACK ALLOCATION PROCESS.....16
III. SUBMISSION EXPECTATIONS FOR FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM REVIEWS.....22

A. Cover-Sheet Template for Five-Year Program Reviews.....22

B. Table of Contents Template.....23

IV. CAPR Format for Response to Five-Year Program Reviews.....25

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 for review and approval and then electronically to the Senate Office. Since these reports include accountability measures and quality improvement provisions, these reports inform the decision-making procedures for the Programs, Departments, and Colleges, particularly with regard to resource allocation decisions 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 Program Reports and Five (5) Year Academic Review Reports, will be an integral part of the resource allocation process. Annual Program Reports are an integral part of requests for additional resources, including tenure-track hires. Five Year Academic Reviews provide an opportunity for long-term planning.

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, the 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 all baccalaureate, master's and doctoral degree programs, and shall include curricular and academic support programs such as General Education and Athletics; and University wide resources such as the Library and computing services. Generally, reviews of graduate programs will be scheduled at the same time as the review of the undergraduate program(s) within the same discipline. However, graduate programs are expected to provide specific program data and analysis on all elements where possible. The 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. ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT

1. Introduction and Planning Discussions

The Annual Report provides the basis for planning consultation between the program and appropriate administrators, to present facts and record the outcome(s) of processes for reference in the future. The Annual Report is also the basis for any new resources, including tenure-track hires, that a program may request. The Annual Report should provide evidence of the program's work completed during the previous annual assessment cycle. Each program is expected to report on the full assessment cycle for one program learning outcome in each annual report.

The assessment cycle, which includes review and alignment of PLOs to the program curriculum (i.e. curriculum mapping), assessment planning, direct and indirect assessment, actions taken to close-the-loop, and reporting, will be completed by all programs every year. CAPR and programs will coordinate PLO assessment activities and reporting with the Educational Effectiveness Council.

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 for both external accredited programs and non-externally accredited programs. 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 last five-year plan
- 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
- Annual program of assessment cycle provides ongoing analysis of program learning outcomes
- 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 external 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
- The Annual Report will also serve as the tenure-track hiring request document for the Academic Year in which it is filed, e.g. the Annual Report filed in Fall 2018 is the tenure-track hiring request for searches conducted in AY 19 – 20.

Annual Report Timeline

After consultation with the program faculty, the Program Chair/Director will submit the Annual Report to the College Dean by the fourth week of the Fall 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 Senate Office Coordinator and will be available to CAPR as additional information during the Program's Five-Year Review Process.

Annual Reports shall consist of the following parts, described in detail below:

1. A Brief Self Study
 2. A Summary of Assessment Results
 3. Discussion of program data and resource request
1. Self-Study: A 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. It will also include any changes related to SB1440- The STAR Act- if applicable. 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 self-study should include a reflection on the assessment data and program statistics. This report will be developed during the Fall term by the Program Unit, discussed with appropriate administrators, and a copy will be kept on file in the Senate Office. Together with the most recent program review, these reports form part of the basis for short-term planning consultations between the Program Unit and appropriate administrators. The collection of Annual Reports since the last program review will assist CAPR and the program in writing and reviewing the next program review document.

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

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

Rather than assess all the PLOs when the five-year review self-study is prepared, programs stagger their assessment over the five years between reviews. This allows programs to assess one or more outcomes each year and report on them in this Annual Report to make the assessment, annual review, and five-year review processes more manageable.

The Annual Report assessment section includes the following information:

- Which program learning outcome was assessed
- What assessment instrument(s) were used to measure this SLO
- What participants were sampled to assess this SLO
- What assessment results were obtained, highlighting important findings from the data collected
- How the assessment results were (or will be) used, e.g. changes in course content, course sequence, student advising, etc., as well as any revisions to the assessment process the results suggests are needed

Please use the template in the appendix for your report.

3. Discussion of Program Data and Resource Request.

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

C. FIVE-YEAR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAMS

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 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;

Programs with this recommendation generally have the following characteristics:

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

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

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

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

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

modification in the past and that have failed to take corrective action.

d) Discontinuance of the Program

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

1. Non-probationary loss of accreditation.
2. Declining student headcount over time and dropping service FTES.
3. On-going lack of assessment.
4. Failure to address achievement gaps.
5. Reduction of tenure-track faculty to very low levels.
6. Failure to correct modification requests.
7. Unsatisfactory conclusion of CAPR monitoring period.
8. Failure to submit five-year review.

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

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

D. CONTENTS OF FIVE-YEAR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS FOR PROGRAMS WITHOUT EXTERNAL ACCREDITATION.

E. 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, Analysis and Decision Support (IRADS) (available annually for all programs, including those not undergoing an Academic Review). In the year of a Five-Year Review, the last five years of data, including the review year, will be used to support the program's Self-Study. In addition, the program will provide the following information in the Self-Study:
 - 2.1. Summary of Previous Five-Year Review and Plan and subsequent Annual Program Reports.** This document will address a summary of the last program review and the plan developed at that time, discuss the program's progress in implementing that Plan and/or modification to the Plan as reported in its Annual Reports, and discuss any discrepancies between the last Program Review and the ensuing Annual Reports. This document will also describe achievements of the program since the last review (if not mentioned above), for example, important curricular changes, grants, faculty professional achievements, external honors received by students, changes in location or mode of instructional delivery.

- 2.2. Assessment and Curriculum:** This section should contain a summary and analysis of the program's Assessment Plan. Reports that include multiple programs must contain a separate assessment summary for each program. This summary should contain:
- a) a list of the program's learning outcomes (PLOs),
 - b) a curriculum map demonstrating the alignment of courses to PLOs,
 - c) a description of what assessment measures have been used to measure each of the PLOs,
 - d) a summary of the findings from the program learning outcomes assessed since the last program review and indicate if the desired levels of learning were achieved from each of these assessments, and
 - e) a discussion of any program improvement actions taken based on the findings.

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

- 2.3. Student Success:** Programs should discuss how they are addressing student success particularly with reference to retention rate, graduation rates, achievement gaps, course bottlenecks, use of high impact practices, advising, course redesign, and other measures.
- 2.4. External Comparisons.** This section shall provide a review, showing how the department's course offerings and requirements compare to those of corresponding programs in the CSU system and to nationally recognized programs in the field.
- 2.5. General Program Discussion:** The program should discuss in detail the data provided by IRADS; outline the current position of the program in terms of its resources; and how the program is seeking to address its program goals, program level objectives, and university goals in the context of current resources and future trends. The program discussion should include, at a minimum, the following topics:
- e) Student demographics of majors, minors, and options
 - f) Student level of majors, minors, and options
 - g) Faculty and academic resource allocation
 - h) Course data: Included will be summaries of climate and advising or scheduling surveys, as well as information on recruitment activities and materials.
 - a. A discussion of the impact on program quality of trends in enrollment, student-faculty ratio, percentage of courses and students taught by regular faculty, number of majors, and other relevant information must be included. If the diversity of the student body varies from the campus at large, discuss the potential reasons for this difference and the impact on program(s).
 - b. 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).
 - c. 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).

- d. Discuss the distribution of teaching resources in lower and upper division courses and the implications of this distribution on program(s).
- e. 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).
- f. 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).
- g. 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).
- h. Discuss the courses and programs offered at Concord, including the number of each; potential changes to the offerings in the next five years; how the program in Concord aligns with programs at Hayward, Online, or other venues; and the impact of the programs/courses.
- i. 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.
- j. For graduate programs, provide application and enrollment data over the review period, and discuss any trends and their effect on program quality.
- k. Discuss other data elements as appropriate to the program(s).

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

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

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

- 3. Plan.** The 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 External Reviewer. After receiving the External Reviewer's Report, the program review committee shall either amend the draft plan to comply with the recommendations of the External Reviewer or explain why no amendment is necessary.

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

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

3.2 Assessment. What is the program’s assessment plan for the next five years? What if any changes will you make to your Program Learning Outcomes? What is your schedule for assessing your PLOs? What assessment processes will you be using to assess your PLOs?

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

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

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

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

Elements of the preceding five areas (3.1 – 3.5) addressed in the Plan should include the following, where relevant:

- i. The expected action/change to be taken, e.g., revision of curriculum, addition of faculty, purchase of equipment, etc.
- ii. A specific time line for completing the task.
- iii. Person(s) responsible for carrying out the needed change.
- iv. Anticipated cost.

4. External Reviewer’s Report. Every Five-year Review must include an External Reviewer. To assist

the review process, the External Reviewer will receive:

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

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

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

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

5. **Program’s Response.** Upon receiving the External Reviewer’s Report, the faculty of the program will respond in writing. Recommendations, concerns and issues raised by the External Reviewer will be addressed in light of the Mission Statement, program need, the Plan, fiscal limitations and logistical issues.
6. **Dean’s Acknowledgement.** The Five-Year Program Review should include a statement from the Dean acknowledging that he/she has reviewed the Five-Year program review document and will monitor the program’s program review process to ensure timely and thoughtful completion of the Five Year Review of any CAPR recommendations in said Program Review documents. The Dean should include a short response to the five-year plan and its resource implication.

Program Review Submission

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

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 initiated by the CAPR Chair and 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. Program Chair submits request for approval of External Review to College Dean, then forwarded to AVP APGS.

- ☑ 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 15th (or before): the Response to the Reviewer's Report and Revised plan are due in electronic format to the Senate Office on May 15th. **An electronic copy of the entire 5 Year Program Review** (in the required format and with a program summary page and copies of all of the Annual Reports submitted to CAPR since the prior 5 Year Program Review) are also due in the Senate Office on May 15th.
- ☑ 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.

E. FIVE-YEAR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW FOR PROGRAMS 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. 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 field of instruction, along with a summary of the main findings of its outside accrediting body.

2. Submission Summary. This shall summarize in no more than five (5) pages the entire report, including items 3-5 below.
3. Plan. Follow the requirements listed in Section 3 for programs *without* external accreditation.
4. Units. For programs requiring more than 180 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. If an Associate's Degree for Transfer exists (under SB 1440, also known as the STAR Act) for the program, indicate if the transfer degree was determined to be "similar" (meaning students holding this degree would be able to complete the Bachelor's degree and any options or concentrations in 90 quarter units). If any changes to the curriculum have occurred since the last program review, indicate how those changes have affected the requirements of SB 1440. Provide a list of other CSUs and California Community Colleges that have approved the STAR Act curriculum in question (contact APGS if assistance is needed).
5. Accreditation Guidelines. A copy of the outside accreditation review documentation and a copy of the guidelines, criteria or other requirements of the outside accrediting body.

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 collect and or compile the additional materials required by CAPR (in the required format and with a program summary page and copies of all of the Annual Reports submitted to CAPR since the prior 5 Year Program Review). These materials will be provided electronically to the Senate Office no later than the 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 an electronic copy of the required materials and an electronic 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.

F. 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 **first CAPR meeting of November (and must be signed by the Dean)** during the year in which the review is originally scheduled. In extraordinary circumstances, CAPR has approved two-year extensions.
 - b. If an extension is approved, in order to prepare for the following year's review, the program shall submit a progress report (or draft submission) by May 1 of the academic year in which the APR was originally scheduled, indicating the state of data collection and preparation of the APR document. The program shall schedule the external review during the 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 31st of the extension year.

G. MISSING OR INCOMPLETE SUBMISSIONS

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

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

If the Response to the 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 formally request discontinuance. 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 and without regular annual reports.

Annual Reports

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

H. 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 the program's program review process to ensure timely and thoughtful completion of the Five Year Review and implementation of any CAPR recommendations in said Program Review documents.

II. 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.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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 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.

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.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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

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

PRINCIPLE 8: Although certainly there will be exceptions, hiring that offers the best opportunity to improve the education our students receive is of the greatest importance. To be sure, faculty who come to CSUEB should be accomplished and active scholars and/or engaged in significant practical or creative activity related to their disciplines. And they should also be willing to serve the campus and the community. But, first and foremost, they should be teachers.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

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.



COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW RUBRIC FOR ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT REVIEW

History: 08-09 CAPR 23 (revised)

NOTE TO CAPR REVIEWER:

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

YEAR:

PROGRAM:

LAST FIVE-YEAR REVIEW:

NEXT FIVE-YEAR REVIEW:

CAPR REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION DOCUMENT:

(i.e. 13-14 CAPR 22 on Five-year Reviews and Annual Reports by Department webpage)

1.

Does the Annual Report have a self-study?

Yes ___ No ___

2.

Does the Annual Report record progress with departmental planning and review? – does it describe progress toward the program’s defined goals, any problems reaching its goals, any revisions to goals, and any new initiatives taken with respect to goals?

Yes ___ No ___

[Empty rectangular box for response]

3

Does the Annual Report detail progress on fulfilling programmatic needs? – does it record significant events which have occurred or are imminent, such as changes to resources, retirements, new hires, curricular changes, honors received, etc?

Yes ___ No ___

[Empty rectangular box for response]

4.

Does the Annual Report have a summary of assessment results and ensuing or necessary revisions?
Yes ___ No ___

Please identify whether the following information is identifiable:

Which program learning outcome (PLO) was assessed:
Yes ___ No ___

What assessment instrument(s) were used to measure this PLO:
Yes ___ No ___

What participants were sampled to assess this PLO:
Yes ___ No ___

What assessment results were obtained, highlighting important findings from the data collected:
Yes ___ No ___

How the assessment results were (or will be) used as well as any revisions to the assessment process the results suggests are needed:
Yes ___ No ___

5.
Does the Annual Report contain a reflection upon progress made and changes with respect to the program learning outcomes assessment plan that is reported on in the five-year review self-study?
Yes ___ No ___

Key points:

6.
Does the Annual Report include information about an associated minor(s)?
Yes___ No___

7.
Does the Annual Report include a discussion of program data?
Yes___ No___

8.
Does the Annual Report include a request for additional resources including tenure-track hiring requests?
Yes___ No___

III. Submission Expectations for Five-Year Program Reviews

A. Cover-Sheet Template for Five-Year Program Review

California State University, East Bay

5-Year Program Review for
[insert program name]

[insert academic year of the review]

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

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

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

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

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

Submission Expectations for Five-Year Program Reviews 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 Program Learning	??
2.3. Students, Advising, and Retention	??
2.4. Faculty	??
2.5. Resources	??
2.6. Units Requirement and Transfer Model Curriculum	??
3. Five-Year Plan	??
3.1. Curriculum	??
3.2. Students	??
3.3. Faculty	??
3.4. Other Resources	??
4. External Reviewer(s)' Report	??
5. Program Response to External Reviewer(s)' Report	??
Appendices	??
A	??
B	??
C	??
etc.	??

CAPR Five-Year Review Rubric

	Does not meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations
Program Summary			
Summary of Previous Review / Five Year Plan			
Program Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan			
Course Offerings			
GE Course Assessment (if applicable)			
Inclusion and Analysis of Student Performance Review Statistics			
Faculty			
Campus Resources			
Unit Requirements and Transfer Model Curriculum			
5 Year Plan: Curriculum			Includes: action/change, timeline, person(s) in charge, and cost
5 Year Plan: Students			
5 Year Plan: Faculty			
5 Year Plan: Resources			
External Reviewer Report			
Response to External Reviewer Report			

IV. 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