Recommendations for completion of the Self-Study and Program Plan

The UPRC recommends the following in the preparation of the Self-Study and Program Plan:

1. For programs that include both undergraduate and graduate programs, either each program is reviewed separately, or if combined, the review must specify ways to address the review requirements for each program.
2. The UPRC has members who may be unfamiliar with the discipline being reviewed. It is helpful to avoid too much discipline-specific jargon and/or bring them up to speed with introductions, where necessary. Whenever extensive use of jargon or acronyms is required, a glossary should be provided to assist the reviewers.
3. Evidence-based claims and requests are essential components that precede a UPRC endorsement of a program request. For example, a request for a tenure-track hire will be better received if the argument goes beyond "replacement of lost faculty lines" or "necessary expertise" and also establishes need for the new hire based on meeting enrollment demand within a sustainable student-to-faculty ratio and addressing the current proportion of entitled faculty within the unit.
4. Pages must be sequentially numbered.
5. The UPRC would appreciate a double-sided format and spiral binding, if size is extensive. An electronic copy and two complete hard copies (including all appendices) should be submitted to the Office of Academic Programs.
6. Figures and tables should be numbered, have proper titles and captions, and be referenced within the text.
7. While the UPRC recommends page limits for major sections of the Self-Study and Program Plan, it is important for the program faculty to address all the points in the template thoroughly.

Please use the following template face page and content headings.

Department of [Insert Dept. Name]
California State University, Bakersfield

[LIST DEGREE PROGRAM TITLE(S)]
SELF-STUDY AND PROGRAM PLAN

AY 20XX-20XX through AY 20XX-20XX

Certification

This is to certify that:

- This document was developed by [insert names of Self-Study committee chair and members].
- This document was approved by majority vote of the program faculty on [insert date).
- All program/department faculty members (full- and part-time) were given the opportunity to provide feedback to the document.

Signature: _____ (Self-Study Committee Chair) Date: _____

NOTE FOR ACCREDITED PROGRAMS: For content that is included in the programs' accreditation reports, relevant material may be inserted or referenced in the Self-Study and Program Plan document.

I. **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

II. **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (approximately 1 page)**
Briefly describe the role of the program within the university context; identify the program's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges to improvement; and provide future directions for program maintenance and improvement.

III. **SELF-STUDY**
  A. **What has changed since the previous review? (approximately 2-3 pages)**
     1. How were the recommendations from previous External Reviewer, UPRC, and Provost addressed by the Program?
     2. Other relevant changes may be included here if not discussed elsewhere.

  B. **Program's role in relationship to the university (approximately 2 pages)**
     1. Relate the Program mission, goals, and objectives to those of the University.
     2. Describe the relationship between program learning outcomes (PLOs) and university learning outcomes (ULOs).
        - The UPRC suggests the use of an alignment matrix – see last page of the template. It can serve as a useful tool for understanding how PLOs and ULOs are aligned.
     3. Provide a curriculum map in the Appendix and use it to describe how the curriculum is designed and how that design addresses the PLOs.
     4. Briefly describe the program's role in all associated programs that significantly affect the degree program resources (General Education and other university-wide requirements, developmental coursework, service courses for other majors, certificate programs, interdisciplinary programs, minors, pre-med, pre-law, etc.).

  C. **Evidence of program quality (approximately 20 pages, excluding graphs and tables)**
     1. Evidence of student learning outcomes (SLOs) based on the Program assessment criteria
        a. Use SLO data to demonstrate program quality as it relates to the degree.
        b. Disaggregate and compare data by mode of delivery (online, remote ITV, face-to-face), by campus location (Bakersfield, AV, or Extended Education), and other significant populations.
        c. Changes in the curriculum brought about by assessment of SLOs
        d. Placement of students in careers, graduate/professional programs
        e. Measures of student involvement in scholarship or creative activities
        f. Feedback from alumni (e.g., alumni satisfaction surveys), Advisory Boards, and/or employers (e.g., employer satisfaction surveys)
     2. Evidence of faculty and program effectiveness

     a. Measures of successful degree completion
     b. Analyze student retention and graduation measures (graduation rates, time-to-degree, units at degree), describing efforts to improve such measures.
     c. Describe how the CSUB Program compares to similar programs at other universities in terms of curriculum requirements, SFR, number of faculty, and graduation rates.
     d. Record of peer-reviewed scholarship for each faculty member (e.g., grants, professional presentations, journal articles, books, book chapters, monographs, exhibitions, performances, and creative works).
   - The UPRC recommends summarizing this information in a table.
   - Do not include scholarship prior to the last review.
   - Provide indicators of quality that may not be apparent outside of the discipline (e.g., indicate peer-review status and impact factor, where applicable).
   - Describe how the scholarship has enhanced the degree program.

3. Evidence of how the Program serves the community
     a. Describe Program activities for applied learning.
     b. Field placements, internships, practice-based learning opportunities, grant partnerships, etc.
     c. Efforts to recruit students and faculty who reflect the diversity of the community

D. Evidence of program viability and sustainability (approximately 10 pages)
1. Analyze trends for demand and need for the Program
     a. Numbers of student majors, applications and admits in the case of post baccalaureate programs, enrollments, and degrees granted since the previous review
     b. Trends within the profession, local community or society generally that identifies an anticipated need, or lack thereof, for the program in the future (including, if available, market research)
2. Faculty resources
     a. Proportions of faculty ranks, SFR, cost/FTES, class size and FTES by category
     b. Trends since the previous review
     c. Faculty workload (i.e., direct WTU teaching assignments and reassigned time by faculty member) disaggregated by course category (GE, major, service, developmental)
     d. Professional and leadership development
     e. Mentoring of faculty
     f. Retention and succession planning
3. Financial resources
     a. Analyze the operational budget (revenues and expenditures).
     b. Percentage of external funding in relationship to operational costs
     c. Assessment of administrative support services
4. Supplies, equipment, and other resources, as appropriate
     a. Information and Technology Resources

b. Equipment
c. Facilities
5. Oversight and management of required resources

IV. PROGRAM PLAN (approximately 15 pages)

The Program uses the evidence-based inquiry and analyses documented in the comprehensive Self-Study to inform future planning for program maintenance and improvement.

In the Program Plan, the program faculty should consider how the results from their Self-Study can be used to:

A. Inform long-term planning
1. What are the program's goals for the next seven years?
2. How will the program specifically address any weaknesses identified in the Self-Study?
3. How will the program build on existing strengths?
4. Where can the formation of collaborations improve program quality?

In addressing such questions, program faculty should consider how program review results are used in the planning and budgeting progress, for program review provides a way for institutions to link evidence of academic quality and student learning with planning and budgeting. That is, the findings in the Self-Study, the recommendations in the external review, and responses to previous reviews can be used as evidence to inform decision-making processes at various levels in the institution, from the program-level through the university-level.

B. Inform curriculum planning
1. Providing the program's assessment plan for the next review cycle
2. Address the following items when applicable:
   a. Changing the sequence of courses in the major curriculum
   b. Adding or deleting courses
   c. Refinement or articulation of pre-requisite or disciplinary requirements
   d. Re-design of the content or pedagogy of specific courses

   The primary questions driving such changes would be:
   - Are our students achieving the desired learning outcomes for the program?
   - If not, what elements of the curriculum could be changed to improve learning?

C. Assess changes in how resources are used within the program
   Address the following items when applicable:
1. Evaluating whether current offerings are the right mix going forward. Should some programs be placed on moratorium, discontinued, or return from moratorium? Should new programs be developed?
2. Assignment of faculty to teach specific courses or sections

3. Changing the scheduling of certain courses or the frequency with which they are offered.
4. Changing the number of students required in course sections so that student learning and effectiveness of teaching are maximized.
5. Implementing improved advising and support services to increase learning, retention, and/or graduation rates.
6. Adjusting the allocation of faculty resources across General Education, the major, and the graduate program (if appropriate).
7. Providing additional professional development or research resources for faculty.
8. Adjusting faculty teaching loads and assigned/release time.

Some guiding questions that could be addressed are:
- What internal improvements are possible with existing resources (through reallocation)?
- How can resources within the department be allocated in such a way as to better achieve the mission and goals of the department?
- At what point in the prioritization of departmental goals do these recommendations fall?
- What are the costs of each recommendation (both the direct monetary cost and the opportunity cost in the form of lost resources for other initiatives)?
- What is the extent of departmental funds available and where might the department turn for external funding?

D. **Make recommendations for how resources outside the program should be used**. (May want to refer to the section on Supplies, Equipment, and Other Resources)

E. **Make a case to the dean and to the University Program Review Committee for specific additional resources as indicated**. For example, the program may request:
1. Additional or reduction of faculty or support staff
2. Additional funds to support faculty professional travel or research
3. Release time for program assessment activities, curriculum development or research-related activities
4. A reduction or increase in program enrollment target
5. What improvements can only be addressed through additional resources?

V. APPENDICES
Provide supporting evidence that is too detailed to be included in the text itself but may be referenced throughout. In addition to those appendices outlined below, the program may choose to add its own (e.g., accredited programs should include accreditation documents).

A. **Academic Program Data Profile (provided by IRPA)**
B. **Curriculum Map**
C. **Up-to-date catalog copy**

D. Roadmaps to graduation
E. Faculty Abbreviated Vitae (2 pages each)

Alignment Matrix

The following example shows the relationship between program learning outcomes (PLOs) and University Learning Outcomes (ULOs). In this example, ULOs are listed in the vertical axis and -PLOs are listed in the horizontal axis. An "X" indicates alignment.

	Goal I					Goal II			Goal III				Goal IV			
	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	2.1	2.2	2.3	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4
1A	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X				X	X	X	
1B						X	X		X				X			
1C						X								X		
1D	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X				X	X	X	
1E						X										
1F	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X						
2A						X	X		X				X			
2B						X								X		
2C	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X						X	
2D	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X				X		X	
3A	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X						
3B	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X					X	
3C						X										
4A	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X						
4B	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X						
4C	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X						
5A																
5B						X						X				
5C																
5D						X						X				
5E	X	X	X	X	X	X						X				
6A							X				X					X
6B																
6C							X		X	X					X	
6D						X							X	X		