




California State University, Sacramento
Faculty Senate
6000 J Street • Sacramento, CA 95819-6036
T (916) 278-6593 • F (916) 278-5358 • www.csus.edu/acse

November 15, 2013

To: Alexander Gonzalez
President
Via: Charles Gossett
Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
From: Janet Hecsh 
Chair, Faculty Senate
Subj: Faculty Senate Actions – November 14, 2013

The Faculty Senate, at its meeting of November 14, 2013, took the following actions and they are provided for your consideration and approval.

**FS 13/14-46/EC Committee Appointment – University
Honorary Doctorate Committee**

The Faculty Senate recommends the appointment of Jacqueline Irwin, Communication Studies (A&L) to the Honorary Doctorate Committee. Term: 2013 - 2016

Carried.

FS 13/14-32/EX Academic Program Review Manual, Adoption Of

The Faculty Senate adopts the following Academic Program Review Manual as prepared by PROC for use in the Academic Program Review through AY 2014-2015 (unless the overriding policy should change in the interim). PROC shall receive recommendations for revising the manual and provide the Senate an updated manual no later than March 1, 2015.

Carried.

The items below are provided for your information.

Appointments of faculty representatives to the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) are forwarded to VP Lee, Administration and Business Affairs, for consideration and approval.

**FS 13/14-44/EC Committee Appointment – University
Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)**

The Faculty Senate recommends the appointment of Thomas Pyne, Philosophy (A&L) to the Transportation Advisory Committee and for the term of appointment to begin immediately.
Term: November 2013 – December 2016

Carried.

At the time of adjournment this matter was under discussion and a substitute motion was being debated on the floor.

FS 13/14-42/EX Policy on Instructional Program Priorities (IPP): Academic Planning, Resource Allocation and Enrollment Management, Amendment Of ACA-144

The following items were not addressed prior to adjournment and will be taken up at a future Faculty Senate meeting as noted below:

Second Reading:

FS 13/14-43/EC APR / IPP Task Force Establishment Of

FS 13/14-18/EX Program Impaction Policy, Revision of FS 12/13-27/EX (November 1, 2012) General Policies For:

First Reading:

FS 13/14-38/EX Timely Declaration of Major (FS 12/13-127) and Undergraduate Academic Advising Policy (FS 12/13-126), President's Gonzalez's Proposed Amendments To:

FS 13/14-41/CPC/EX Program For Bachelor Of Arts/Bachelor Of Science: Special Major, Amendment Of: (FSP00020.htm)

JH:kg

Attachment: FS 13/14-32/EX

Approved by the Faculty Senate, November 14, 2013.

FS 13/14-32/EX Academic Program Review Manual, Adoption Of

The Faculty Senate adopts the following Academic Program Review Manual as prepared by PROC for use in the Academic Program Review through AY 2014-2015 (unless the overriding policy should change in the interim). PROC shall receive recommendations for revising the manual and provide the Senate an updated manual no later than March 1, 2015.

Carried.

**California State University, Sacramento
Program Review Manual**

Table of Contents:

- I. Overview (p.1)
- II. Self-study (p.2)
- III. Timeline for the Program Review Process (p.4)
- IV. Roles and Responsibilities of Department Chair, College Dean, Review Team Chair, and Director of Office of Academic Program Assessment (p.5)
- V. Review Teams (p.7)
- VI. External Consultants (p.7)

I. Overview

Program review on our campus incorporates the model of program/institutional review as practiced by WASC (Western Association of Schools and Colleges), our accrediting organization. Program review therefore attends first and foremost to degree-granting programs, as opposed to academic units (e.g. departments). Program review also attends carefully to issues involving assessment of student learning.

Program Review Intent and Procedure:

Modus operandi:

- The program review process is to be based first and foremost on the improvement of our University's academic programs.
- Review teams and their chairs are expected to offer whatever assistance they can to help to facilitate the review.
- The Office of Academic Program Assessment is expected to help with issues related to the assessment of student learning.
- The program review is intended to be relevant at the College and University levels; the college dean and the Provost are expected to be fully engaged in the process.

- As part of the preparation for the Self-study, the Office of Institutional Research has developed data sets for each academic unit. These sets will be provided to the academic unit at the outset of the program review process and should prove very helpful in providing a large portion of the information needed in preparing the Self-study.

Program Review and External Accreditation:

Program review at our University attempts to integrate, to the extent reasonable, campus program review and accreditation by external agencies, so long as this can be made to comply with the normal six-year cycle of program review. Academic Affairs is responsible for orchestrating the integration. Academic units with accredited programs are advised to consult with the Office of Academic Affairs regarding program review requirements. An academic unit has the right to request a full program review (including visit by an external consultant) regardless of accreditation status. If a full review is not requested, the normal procedure will involve review of the accreditation self-study report by the Program Review Oversight Committee, which will determine whether or not this report is acceptable in lieu of a campus self-study. If the Committee determines that it is not acceptable, a review team chair will be appointed in order to oversee a more extensive review. In all cases, at the conclusion of the review process a program review report that has been approved by the Program Review Oversight Committee will be submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval, per the process clarified in the Timeline section (III.) of this manual.

II. Self-study

For the purpose of program review “degree-granting programs” include all programs; minor and certificate programs, however, do not need to be included in the Self-study’s summary of learning outcomes and their assessment (see information on Section 2 below).

The program review involves in general a review of the academic unit’s mission and goals as they relate to the mission of the institution; the curriculum through which the mission and goals are pursued; the extent to which each program (major[s] and concentration[s]) of the academic unit is achieving its learning outcomes; the quality and diversity of the faculty and staff and their contributions to achieving the mission and goals; and the quality of the infrastructure supporting the academic unit (e.g., library and other educational resources, physical facilities, etc.).

Academic units are strongly encouraged to involve their faculty in all stages of the program review, including design of the Self-study. The chair of the academic unit, the college dean, the review team chair, and the Office of Academic Affairs all sign off on the Self-study proposal and the timeline for its preparation. The Office of Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs is available to provide consultation and assistance, as feasible, at all stages in the process.

To support the review, all academic units are expected to include in their Self-studies, as detailed in the three sections below:

1. General information about the academic unit and its degree programs, e.g., data on students, faculty, staff, facilities, etc. (most of which is supplied by the Office of Institutional

Research); also provide a summary overview of responses to the Recommendations set forth in the most recent program review.

2. A summary of learning outcomes of each degree program (majors, concentrations, graduate and credential programs required; minor and certificates normally are optional*), means of assessing them, and results of assessment efforts.
3. The results of a focused inquiry addressing issues of particular interest/concern to the academic unit, in the context of what is currently important to the College and University.
4. Suggested length of Self-study: 35 pages maximum. A longer Self-study is acceptable with consent of the program review team chair.

*Academic Affairs will inform academic units at the outset of the program review process if any minor or certificate programs must be included in the review.

1. General information about the academic unit and its degree programs, e.g., data on students, faculty, staff, facilities, etc. (most of which is supplied by the Office of Institutional Research); provide a summary overview of responses to the Recommendations set forth in the most recent program review.

Drawing on information contained in, for example, the academic unit's entry in the University Catalog, the website, the *Factbook*, and the Alumni Survey report, provide a summary overview designed to offer members of the campus community a clear understanding of the academic unit's mission and scope, including an overview of all degree programs and of GE/GR and service courses.

Provide a summary overview of responses to Recommendations set forth in the most recent program review. The overview does not need to include supporting evidence or detailed explanations; it normally can be accomplished within the space of two pages.

2. A summary of learning outcomes of each degree program (majors and concentrations required; minors and certificates normally are optional—see above), means of assessing them, data and results of assessment efforts. Please provide

1. summaries of the assessment efforts in the last review cycle by completing Tables 2.1 and 2.2 based on annual assessment reports, program assessment plans, and any other relevant information (please provide this information as appendices to the Self-study; for templates see the Program Review Tables document provided by the Office of Academic Program Assessment);
2. comprehensive assessment plans for all programs in the academic unit for the next review cycle (by completing Tables 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5); and
3. a short narrative that includes the following sections:
 - a. **Introduction:** Provide simple and clear narratives to summarize how each program learning outcome is linked to the missions and goals of the University and the academic unit, including (for undergraduate programs) the University's Baccalaureate Learning Goals.
 - b. **Methods:** Provide simple and clear tables and narratives to summarize what methods and tools were used to assess them and why, with an emphasis on the use of direct measures. Attach the rubrics if you have not included them in the annual assessment reports. Include a description of the samples from which data were collected and the frequency

and schedule with which the data in question were collected. Describe and append a sample (or samples) of the “instrument” (e.g., survey or test), “artifact” (e.g., writing sample and evaluative protocol, performance review sheet), or other device used to assess the status of the learning outcomes desired by the program if they were not included in the annual assessment reports.

- c. **Results:** Provide simple and clear tables and narratives to summarize the data and results for each learning outcome for the last five years. What are the criteria and/or standards of performance for each program learning outcome? What data have you collected? What are the results and findings, including the percentage of students who meet each standard? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement?
- d. **Discussion and conclusions:** Provide simple and clear conclusions that summarize the use of assessment results to improve student learning and success. As a result of the last five years’ assessment effort, have you implemented 1) **any changes for your assessment including learning outcomes, assessment plan, assessment tools (methods, rubrics, curriculum map, or key assignment etc.), and/or integration of the University’s Baccalaureate Learning Goals;** 2) **any other changes at the departmental, the college, or the university level, including advising, co-curriculum, budgeting, and planning?**
 - i. If so, what are these changes? How did you implement these changes?
 - ii. If so, how do you know if these changes have achieved the desired results?
 - iii. If no, why not?
- e. **Longer term impact of student learning: Alumni Survey** (Office of Institutional Research can provide the data). Provide simple and clear conclusions, including the narratives to summarize the longer term impacts for each of the student learning outcomes based on the survey.

Period of reference for the above is previous five years. Please make sure that the tables and narratives you provide are easy for diverse audiences to understand and use.

3. The results of a focused inquiry addressing issues of particular interest/concern to the academic unit, in the context of what is currently important to the College and University.

The focused inquiry is an investigation into a matter of substance and importance to the academic unit’s program(s) and the University. The focused inquiry needs to be manageable within the scope of activities carried out and resources provided through the program review process.

Examples of items of special importance to the University include but are not limited to:

- Development of program learning outcomes, rubrics, standards of performance, curriculum maps, and assessment plans for all the programs in the next review cycle (See Tables 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 as examples).
- Attention to factors affecting graduation rates and other elements of student success (e.g., realistic curricular flowcharts, with courses scheduled to make timely graduation possible; clear and reasonable requirements for change of major; advising for majors);

- Preparation of students to be successful professionals, civic leaders, and informed citizens in a diverse national and global society.

III. Timeline for the Program Review Process

Fall Semester

- Data sets and other preliminary information provided to academic units scheduled for review
- Approval of review team chair by chair/dean of academic unit
- Meeting of chair/dean of academic unit and review team chair with assessment consultants from the Office of Academic Program Assessment
- Recommended: academic units invite review team chair to a Fall Semester faculty meeting
- Development of Self-study proposal; this should involve consultation with the review team chair (and possibly the entire team if formed), with the dean, and with the Office of Academic Program Assessment (especially for assistance with regard to assessment)
- By last day of classes: submission of Self-study proposal with cover sheet (available from the Office of Academic Affairs), approved with signatures by chair of academic unit and review team chair, to the dean
- By end of semester: Proposal approved by the dean and forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs (for final sign off)
- Review team chair decides with the Office of Academic Affairs on nature of compensation (release time or professional development funds); if release time, also on the term

Spring Semester

- Review teams are formed based on request by review team chairs
- By last day of classes: Self-study completed and submitted to the review team chair, to the dean, and to the Office of Academic Affairs
- At time of submission of Self-study: Academic units submit preference for external consultant
- Following submission of Self-study and once the review team has been formed and the external consultant appointed, the Office of Academic notifies the academic unit of the date of the external consultant's visit
- Review team's interaction with academic unit, external consultant's visit and report, etc.
- Draft of Program Review Report presented to Program Review Oversight Committee by the end of the seventh week of the semester following the visits and consultations (normally, the draft will be due during the second Fall Semester of the review process)
- Once approved by PROC, the draft of the Program Review Report is sent by the chair of PROC to the chair of the academic unit and the dean of the college for a two-week review period; the chair and the dean are invited to respond as per Faculty Senate guidelines:
The unit [i.e., Department] and the dean are given two weeks to respond to the report, correct inaccuracies in fact or data, and take reasoned exception to judgments or conclusions drawn.
- Draft of Program Review Report revised (if necessary); final draft sent to Faculty Senate for approval

IV. Roles and Responsibilities of Department Chair, College Dean, Review Team Chair, and Director of Office of Academic Program Assessment

Chair of Academic Unit

1. Alert faculty prior to commencement of review process as to the overall nature and schedule of the tasks at hand
 - a. This might include asking for contributions at a Fall Semester departmental meeting, as thoughts develop regarding the Self-study proposal
 - b. Relevant materials (e.g. the Program Review Self-study Guidelines document, the data set from the Office of Institutional Research, the previous Program Review report) should be provided
2. In close collaboration with faculty, the review team chair, and the Office of Academic Program Assessment,
 - a. Submit preference for external consultant by the time of submission of the Self-study
 - b. Oversee completion of the Self-study proposal and the Self-study
 - c. Facilitate review visits and consultations
3. Upon receipt of Program Review Report draft for “two-week” review period, share with faculty and consult with faculty regarding perceived needs for recommended revisions
4. In close collaboration with faculty, take appropriate steps to meet the Program Review Report’s Recommendations to the academic unit

College Dean

1. Work with the chair of the academic unit to develop an approved Self-study proposal
2. As appropriate, engage with the chair and other faculty, the review team (especially the chair), the Office of Academic Program Assessment, and the external consultant in order to facilitate the review process and to provide input along the way
3. Upon receipt of Program Review Report draft for “two-week” review period, respond to the chair of PROC with comments or recommended revisions as deemed suitable
4. Take appropriate steps to meet the Program Review Report’s Recommendations to the College

Review Team Chair

1. Make contact early on with the chair of the academic unit, explaining your role in the review process and offering assistance towards developing thoughts pertaining to the Self-study proposal
 - a. It might be helpful, for example, to review with the chair the data set from the Office of Institutional Research
 - b. It also might be helpful to facilitate interaction between the faculty and the Office of Academic Program Assessment
 - c. Encourage your engagement with the full faculty, for instance at a Fall Semester meeting
2. Work with the academic unit on developing an approved Self-study proposal
3. Decide with the Vice President and Dean for Academic Affairs regarding the nature of your compensation (release time or professional development funds); if release time, determine (also with home department) the term
4. Drawing from the list provided by the Office of Academic Affairs, assemble an effective review team given the nature of the Self-study proposal and the overall task at hand

5. In collaboration with the academic unit, the college dean, the Office of Academic Program Assessment, and the Office of Academic Affairs, assist in facilitating the external consultant's visit and the various consultations during the review process; persons/groups consulted by review team (or chair) and external consultant normally include, at a minimum:
 - Departmental chair
 - College Dean
 - Director of the Office of Academic Program Assessment
 - Departmental faculty and staff
 - Student majors (undergrad and, if applicable, graduate);
 (coordinate with the Office of Academic Affairs when devising schedule for external consultant's visit)
6. Working with the rest of the review team, compile the Program Review Report draft and submit to the Program Review Oversight Committee and the Office of Academic Affairs by the end of the seventh week of the semester following the visits and consultations (normally, the draft will be due during the second Fall Semester of the review process)
7. If so requested by PROC, make recommended revisions to the draft and resubmit for the Committee's approval within two weeks
8. Working with the rest of the review team, respond appropriately to any recommendations for revisions from the chair of the academic unit or the college dean, and submit the revised draft to the chair of PROC

The Office of Academic Program Assessment

1. Beginning before the Fall Semester that marks the commencement of an academic unit's review cycle (i.e., the semester during which the unit will produce its Self-study proposal), assist in review and revision of the unit's assessment plan; ideally, this process will be initiated in the Spring Semester preceding the actual review cycle
2. Assist the academic unit with issues pertaining to assessment as it produces the Self-study report
3. Assist the review team, the dean, and the external consultant with issues pertaining to assessment

V. Review Teams

- A. Program Review Team Composition. Program review teams shall have a minimum of three members, all of whom are to be from among the University's faculty. At least one member is to be from the college of the academic unit under review.
- B. Selection of Review Teams. An annual pool of faculty members will be recommended by the Faculty Senate to Academic Affairs for potential service as program review team members. In forming program review teams, the Provost or designee will draw from the pool of faculty members recommended by the Faculty Senate. If, in the opinion of the Provost or designee, the pool of faculty members recommended by the Faculty Senate is insufficient for adequate formation of the required number of program review teams, the Provost or designee shall request additional recommendations by the Faculty Senate. Aside from the chair, members of the review team are not provided with compensation.

- C. Selection of Team Chairs. Within the Faculty Senate's pool of potential review team members, a further indication will be made by the Faculty Senate of those faculty members recommended for potential service as program review team chairs, normally in recognition of prior successful service as program review team members. The Program Review Oversight Committee maintains a process of performance review of review team members in order better to identify suitable candidates to serve in the future as review team chairs. Academic Affairs chooses review team chairs from the Faculty Senate's pool of potential review team chairs. The chair is to be from outside of the college of the academic unit under review. Academic Affairs provides review team chairs with release time or professional development funds.
- D. Self-disqualification. Appointed members of review teams may disqualify themselves from service if they believe there may be a conflict of interest in serving. Academic units being reviewed may request a change in membership of a review team if the unit presents reasons why a conflict of interest may be present in one or more of the team members.

VI. External Consultants

A. Selection of External Consultant and Steps Preceding Visit

1. The chair/dean of the academic unit submits a list of two or three names of potential consultants to Academic Affairs. It is allowable to submit a ranked list.
2. Academic Affairs sends letters to the nominees to ascertain their willingness to serve. Copies of resumes are requested. Copies of the nominees' resumes are sent to the department chair for review.
3. Upon approval by Academic Affairs, the review team chair formally invites the potential consultant and ascertains possible dates for a campus visit.
4. Academic Affairs sends a letter to the consultant confirming the appointment and outlining the process and procedures for the visit, and sends a copy of the academic unit's Self-study report to the consultant.
5. The review team chair is responsible for providing additional information requested by the consultant with the assistance of Academic Affairs.

B. Responsibilities and Procedures for External Consultant Visit

1. The review team chair arranges in consultation with the academic unit to host the consultant and to be responsible for arranging transportation to and from the airport and hotel, and providing an escort to and from meetings.
2. Academic Affairs schedules the introductory meeting with the review team chair and Academic Affairs, the meeting with the college dean (or designee), the meeting with the Dean for Graduate Studies (if appropriate), and the exit interview. The proposed schedule is sent to the department chair and review team chair.
3. The chair/dean of the academic unit is responsible for arranging and scheduling additional meetings for the consultant with faculty, staff, and students.
4. The review team chair will consult with the academic unit to reserve a time for the consultant to meet with the review team and to meet with the Office of Academic Program Assessment.

5. The exit interview with the consultant, arranged by Academic Affairs, will normally include the college dean, the department chair, a representative from Academic Affairs, the Dean for Graduate Studies (if appropriate), and the review team.
6. The review team chair must submit the final schedule to Academic Affairs one week prior to the consultant's visit. Academic Affairs will send copies of the schedule to the consultant and the review team members.
7. The consultant is expected to submit to Academic Affairs a written report of findings and recommendations within two weeks of the visit. Academic Affairs will distribute copies of the consultant's report to the department chair, the college dean, and the review team members. Academic Affairs issues payment to the external consultant upon receipt of the report.

C. Responsibilities of External Consultant During and After Visit

1. Prior to the campus visit, review the academic unit's Self-study, Assessment Plan, previous annual Assessment Report(s), website, and, in consultation with the review team chair, any other materials that will help facilitate an effective visit.
2. During the time of the visit, be prepared to follow the schedule of meetings that will be provided by the review team chair, asking questions and otherwise seeking information that will assist with writing the report.
3. At the exit interview, provide a preliminary summary overview of impressions and main points that likely will be included in the report. The exit interview will likely also serve as an opportunity to ask more questions and to acquire additional information.
4. The consultant is expected to submit to Academic Affairs a written report of findings and recommendations within two weeks of the visit.

D. Content of the External Consultant's Report

1. Prior to the campus visit, review the academic unit's Self-study, Assessment Plan, previous annual Assessment Report(s), website, and, in consultation with the review team chair, any other materials that will help facilitate an effective visit.
2. An overview of your impressions of the academic unit and of the overall effectiveness of the Self-study, to include consideration of the following:
 - a. Has the academic unit made reasonable responses to the Recommendations from the last program review?
 - b. Has the academic unit responded adequately to major trends in the discipline?
 - c. Is the structure of the curriculum and course offerings in line appropriate in light of similar programs in this discipline?
3. A critical review of the academic unit's configuration of degree-granting programs, the viability of these programs, enrollment, graduation/retention rates, and curricular design (including consideration of the unit's contributions to General Education and other university service components).
4. A critical review of the assessment efforts of the academic unit.
5. Impressions regarding the degree of student contentment and comments reflecting student complaints. For example,
 - a. Do students have the sense that their courses fulfill the learning objectives of the department?
 - b. Do students have sufficient access to enter courses?

- c. Do students believe that they receive adequate advising and career guidance?
- 6. Impressions regarding faculty and staff. For example,
 - a. What is the general level of contentment among faculty?
 - b. Is there a healthy balance between part-time and full-time faculty?
 - c. Is there a healthy gender and ethnicity balance in the faculty?
 - d. Are faculty sufficiently involved in professional development, and are there adequate resources available to support this?
 - e. What is the general level of contentment among staff?
 - f. Are there healthy relations between faculty and staff?

- 7. Impressions regarding institutional resources and support. For example,
 - a. Are there adequate library and IT resources to serve the students in their research and study?
 - b. Are there adequate library and IT resources to support faculty needs?
 - c. Does the academic unit have sufficient support staff?
 - d. Are the offices and supplies for staff and faculty adequate?