



CSU Bakersfield

Mail Stop: 11 EDUC
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, California 93311-1022
(661) 654-3420
(661) 654-6911 FAX

To: Vandana Kohli, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Roger Peck, Chair, UPRC

The University Program Review Committee
Bruce Friedman, Maynard Moe, BJ Moore, Maureen Rush,
Sarah Vanderlip, and Carl Kemnitz, *ex-officio*

C: Soraya Coley, Provost and Academic Vice President of Academic Affairs

Date: May 25, 2011

Re: Summary Report of the UPRC for AY 2011

In Spring 2010, the Academic Senate approved a new academic program review policy, which focuses on evidence based program analysis and ties program reviews to the budgetary process. This document summarizes the accomplishments of the UPRC documents what we have learned about the new process this year.

The UPRC finds that the new procedures improved the process by standardizing the format of the Self-Study and time-line for the program review. This year, the committee implemented the new program review template, completed four program reviews (BAPA in Public Policy in Administration, MPA in Public Administration, BA in Art, and BS in Computer Science), re-scheduled two program reviews (MS in Counseling and MA in Education), and started, but did not complete, two reviews (BS in Physical Education and Kinesiology and BA in Natural Sciences).

This new program review process, provides programs with a venue for them to

- describe how their program integrates with the University Mission,
- assess progress made since is lasts review,
- describe its strategic plan for program growth and development, and
- provide evidence-based arguments for additional resources to accomplish their program plan.

The Committee found that reviewing programs written under the new template was much easier than those written without it. The two program reviews that were rescheduled were written under the previous process.

The membership of the UPRC has been an issue. This academic year began with only one of the faculty members continuing from the previous academic year. A majority of the committee was completely new to the UPRC. The program review process was unfamiliar to the new members

and slowed the program reviews at first. The issue of having little committee memory has been resolved; now half the committee will continue each year. Another membership issue is that the committee has worked without a full complement of members the entire year. One of the two At-large positions on the committee has remained vacant. At this time, no one has been nominated for the vacant position and it appears it will be vacant when the new academic year begins.

All of the problems we encountered with implementing the new process were due to the newness of the process. This year, the UPRC did not provide a timely reminder for all programs being reviewed in AY 2011/2012. Partly, this problem is due to the committee memory problem discussed above. Beginning in Fall 2012, the Chair of the UPRC will notify all the programs to be reviewed in the following academic year. This will allow programs to better manage the time they have to complete their program Self-Study in a timely fashion. It should reduce the need to re-schedule or delay program reviews.

The UPRC has made minor changes to the template and timeline to clarify the process and address issues that appeared this year. For example, changes were made to the timeline regarding the scheduling of the external reviewer's reports. The two unfinished program reviews, potentially could have been completed if the UPRC had not had to wait for about a month for the external reviewer's reports. The committee is not faulting the programs for this delay but the template. The timeline has been clarified to indicate to programs that they should plan for scheduling the external reviewer prior to completion of the Self-Study, that way the external reviewer's visit could be timed much closer to the completion of the Self-Study, avoiding delays.

We also noticed that many program reviews had similar issues or themes. All programs are facing budget constraints and looking for ways in which to save money. Many programs have faculty working overloads or not taking release time. Working an overload temporarily, for example, to start a new program may be acceptable. On the other hand, the UPRC thinks some programs are using these types of fixes to solve their long-term budgetary needs, and that is not desirable as these types of fixes are unsustainable. Another issue has been unwillingness of programs to provide evidence-based rationale for why their programs need more than 180 units, why their programs' time graduation is so long, or why the program needs a new faculty line.

The Academic Senate approved the Academic Program Review Policy and Procedures in Spring 2010 for two years. Based on the program reviews begun and completed this academic year, the UPRC thinks that the new process has already proven to be beneficial. Earlier notification, clarification of the template/timeline, staggered membership, and WTU release time for the second year of service should all make the process even more successful.

At this point, the UPRC believes that the annual reports and MOUAPs (Memorandum of Understanding Action Plans) will be valuable; however it is unlikely that we will have sufficient evidence of this prior to the Spring 2012 deadline. Thus, the UPRC recommends that the Academic Senate, prior to its expiring in Spring 2012, endorse a continuation of the current process with a built-in expectation for re-evaluation every five years, beginning in 2015.