

AGENDA
 Executive Committee Meeting
 CSUSM Academic Senate
 Wednesday ~ March 9, 2011 ~ 12 – 2 p.m. ~ Kellogg 5207

[Send an email to the voting EC members' listserv.](#)

- I. **Approval of Agenda**
- II. **Approval of Minutes of 03/02/2011**
- III. **Chair's Report, Rika Yoshii**
 Referral to committee: APC New policy re second bachelor's degree in light of recently approved program for a second degree in Nursing
- IV. **Vice Chair's Report, Wayne Aitken**
- V. **Old Business**
 FAC Sabbatical Leave policy revision
 NEAC Initiation of amendments to Constitution
- VI. **New Business**
 A. PAC Program Review policy revision
 B. New MOU between APC and Graduate Studies -- Yoshii
- VII. **Provost's Report, Emily Cutrer**
- VIII. **ASCSU Report, Brodowsky/Montanari**
- IX. **CFA Report, Don Barrett**
- X. **Brief Oral Committee Reports** As needed.
- XI. **EC Members' Concerns & Announcements**
 Online courses -- Yoshii

Hot Topics For more information, visit the [Senate website](#)

Restructuring proposal	Early Start program
Diversity	SB 1440
Next Steps Workload Committee	Graduation Initiative
Temecula campus / Self support	

Next meeting: 3/16/11 ~ 12-2 pm ~ Kellogg 5207

Rationale for APC to Work on a policy for Second Bachelor's Degrees

When students are admitted to an undergraduate program with the objective of earning a second bachelor's degree, they may be exempted from certain requirements that were fulfilled when they earned their first degree.

The catalog language on detailing the requirements from which such students would be exempt was removed from the catalog when it was reprinted in 2006 because at that time the University was not accepting second bachelor's students.

Since then, CSUSM has developed an undergraduate program specifically intended for students who already hold a bachelor's degree (the Accelerate Entry Level Baccalaureate Option in the B.S.N.) and is once again accepting second bachelor's students.

The old catalog statement is in need of review (for example, it includes references to the Entry Level Mathematics requirement which do not make sense for holders of a bachelor's degree, and it does not include some State law (specifically legislation concerning second degrees in Nursing) and CSU system requirements (e.g., recognizing General Education from University of California campuses)).

FAC: Sabbatical Leave

Rationale: The primary purpose for this revision is in response to PLC concerns that language regarding proposals and categories be clarified because existing language in the sabbatical policy was not specific enough with regard to proposals that are funded and those that are not. For example, page 5, line 162 through 173 has been changed to reflect recommended proposals or unusually good or timely opportunities. There would be an expectation that all of the recommended proposals would be funded. The second category is conditionally recommended with proposals indicating a high quality faculty project with funding based on availability of resources. Finally the last category: not recommended reflecting proposals that do not indicate a high-quality sabbatical leave project. Recent history indicates these changes originating from individuals whose recommended proposals were not funded. The clarification in VII.A.3.b. or line 163 where we specify conditionally recommended contingent upon the availability of resources will better indicate to individuals the possibility that their sabbatical projects may not be funded. In a few other places in the document specifically lines 107, 167, and line 183 add faculty recommended or conditionally recommended to the language for consistency throughout the rest of the document. You can find these changes also in lines 220 and line 227. Finally, in reviewing the documents, the faculty affairs committee noted language that can be updated to better reflect the CSUSM mission in regard to 21st century higher education and recommends making gender neutrality adjustments in our documents as they are reviewed. For example the use of the "word" s/he can be considered antiquated and so in the cases where the word shows up we have changed the word to 'the individual' and in places where his/her appears, we have adjusted the sentence to be more inclusive and gender-neutral. The evaluation rubric was also revised to align better with the policy and is attached.

Definition: A policy governing the application for and award of sabbatical leaves.

Authority: The collective bargaining agreement between the California State University and the California Faculty Association.

Scope: Eligible faculty unit employees of CSU San Marcos.

I. AUTHORIZATION

Sabbatical leaves are authorized under Article 27 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

II. OBJECTIVE

Sabbatical leaves shall be for purposes that provide a benefit to CSUSM through scholarly research, scholarly and/or creative activity, instructional improvement and/or faculty retraining. Such activities provide a crucial benefit to the instructional needs of CSUSM by improving the competency and enthusiasm of the faculty, by keeping the faculty up-to-date in their fields, and by bringing new ideas and concepts to the campus which will be shared with students and other faculty in and out of the classroom. Sabbatical activities also benefit society and promote the reputation of the university by giving CSUSM faculty a chance to refine ideas developed at CSUSM and spread them to the national and international creative, scholarly and educational communities.

III. ELIGIBILITY

A full-time faculty unit employee shall be eligible for sabbatical leave if:

- 1. S/heThe individual has served full-time for six (6) years at CSU San Marcos in the preceding seven (7) year period prior to the leave; and
2. S/heThe individual has served full-time at least six (6) years after any previous sabbatical leave or difference in pay leave1.

1Difference in Pay Leaves. Academic employees who have completed at least six consecutive academic years

48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94

Note:

- A. Credit granted towards completion of the probationary period for service elsewhere shall also apply towards fulfilling the eligibility requirements for sabbatical.
- B. A leave of absence without pay or service on an academic administrative appointment excluded from the bargaining unit shall not constitute a break in service for eligibility requirements.
- C. For tenure track faculty, final approval of a sabbatical leave is contingent upon having earned tenure.

IV. SALARY

The salary of a faculty employee on a sabbatical leave shall be in accordance with the following:

- 1. One (1) semester at full salary; or
- 2. Two (2) semesters at one-half (1/2) the full salary.

V. SSP-ARs

All full time SSP-ARs are eligible to apply for sabbaticals.

The process for SSP-ARs will be the same as it is for instructional faculty with the following exceptions:

The Professional Leave Committee will evaluate the applications separately from the instructional faculty and assign them to one of the categories identified in Section VII. C.

The Professional Leave Committee will submit their report to the Vice President for Student Affairs instead of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

VI. APPLICATION PROCESS

A. Sabbatical leaves are awarded the year prior to the sabbatical leave itself. Each spring semester, faculty who are eligible to apply for a sabbatical leave shall be notified of their eligibility and the application submission date for the Fall semester. A copy of the notification shall be sent to the Dean and the Department Chair or equivalent². In order to facilitate resource planning, faculty are asked to notify the Dean and Department Chair (or equivalent) as soon as they make the decision to apply for a sabbatical leave.

B. An application for a sabbatical leave shall include the following:

- 1. A 3 to 5 page narrative which states the purpose of the sabbatical leave and gives a detailed description of the applicant's plan of [scholarly research or creative activity, instructional improvement and/or faculty retraining](#) study, research, travel, and/or service. This narrative shall include the following:

of service may be granted a leave of absence for one or more semesters not exceeding one year, with compensation equal to the difference in salary between that received by the person on leave and minimum salary of the instructor rank.

² A faculty member not belonging to a "department" has an appropriate administrator, for example a Center Director or a Program Director, who functions as the equivalent of the Department Chair for the purposes of this document.

95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148

- a. A full description of the proposed activities including a timeline, and, ~~if appropriate,~~ a description of the methodology, and/or course of study (or other types of activities). The activities proposed should be of a nature to clearly make full use of the applicant's working time for the duration of the sabbatical leave.
 - b. An explanation of how the project positively impacts the applicant's professional development (including the ability to carry out responsibilities at CSUSM). The applicant should put the professional development into context. For example, if the proposed activity involves a course of research, the applicant should explain whether it represents a continuation of ongoing research or a change in direction; likewise, if the proposed activities are directed at instructional improvement, the applicant should describe the courses which will benefit and how they will benefit from the proposed activities.
2. A statement specifying the CSU resources (e.g., the need to use one's faculty office/lab, the need to secure an internal grant, or the need for travel funds), if any, necessary to carry it out;
 3. A statement of the time requested, which shall not exceed one (1) year;

Note: A sabbatical leave of two (2) semesters may be implemented within a two (2) consecutive year period.
 4. A copy of the applicant's curriculum vitae and a copy of original reports for previous sabbatical leaves (see Section [IX, Paragraph D](#) ~~VIII, Paragraph 4~~ below).
 5. Applicants who have been recommended [or conditionally recommended](#) for a sabbatical but not funded in any of the previous two years may also include copies of previous recommendations from the Professional Leave Committee for one or both of the previous two years.
- C. The application (9 copies) shall be submitted to the Professional Leave Committee via the Office of the Academic Senate. The Office of the Academic Senate shall distribute seven copies to the Professional Leave Committee, one copy to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs - Academic Resources office and one copy to the applicant's department (or equivalent unit).
- D. A difference in pay leave may be filed simultaneously with a request for a sabbatical leave according to academic unit policy and procedures but only one type of leave may be granted.

VII. EVALUATION PROCESS

- A. A Professional Leave Committee shall review sabbatical applications, considering questions related to the quality of the proposed sabbatical leave project.
1. The Professional Leave Committee shall be constituted as follows:
 - a. The Professional Leave Committee shall be elected on an annual basis by probationary and tenured faculty unit employees.
 - b. The Professional Leave Committee shall be an all university committee composed of full-time tenured professors.

149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200

- c. ~~One NEAC will determine the number of members from each unit as appropriate. At least one member shall be elected from the faculty by the eligible faculty in each of the following areas: Education, Business, Science and Mathematics, Humanities and Fine Arts, the Social Sciences, college and the Library by the eligible faculty. The distribution of areas shall parallel the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion committee.~~ One at-large representative shall be elected from the faculty as a whole.³
 - d. Faculty unit employees applying for a sabbatical leave shall not be eligible for election to the Professional Leave Committee.
2. The Professional Leave Committee shall use the following criteria listed in order of importance in evaluating the merit of applications proposals:
- a. The quality of the professional development of the applicant through scholarly research or creative activity, instructional improvement and/or faculty retraining research, scholarly and creative activity, instructional improvement or faculty renewal with no implied priority among these (including the impact on the faculty member's ability to carry out ~~his/her~~ responsibilities to CSUSM).
 - b. The quality of the application proposal in terms of clarity, purpose, methods, and objectives.
3. The Professional Leave Committee shall group applications proposals into the following categories:
- a. ~~Highly Recommended: Applications~~ Exceptionally Recommended: Applications ~~Proposals that indicate exceptionally high quality projects or projects which represent an unusually good or timely opportunity/opportunities. The expectation is that all Recommended applications proposals will be funded.~~
 - b. Conditionally Recommended: Applications ~~Projects Proposals~~ that indicate a high quality sabbatical leave projects. The expectation is that funding of these Conditionally Recommended applications proposals is will be based on the availability of resources.
 - c. ~~Not Recommended Against: Applications~~ Projects Proposals that do not indicate a high quality sabbatical leave projects.
- The Professional Leave Committee shall recommend against all applications proposals whose proposed activities are not of a nature to account for all of the applicant's working time for the duration of the sabbatical leave.
- The ~~Highly Recommended~~ category should be a small, select group. In no case should more than 25% of the proposals be assigned to this category.
4. The Professional Leave Committee shall rank order all applications in the Conditionally Recommended Category (this information will not be included in the letter sent to the applicant).
5. The Professional Leave Committee shall submit a letter for each application to the Vice President for Academic Affairs giving the following information (a) the category of

³The distribution of areas was chosen to parallel the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion committee.

201 recommendation (~~Highly~~ Recommended, Conditionally Recommended, or Not
202 Recommended ~~Against~~), (b) the reasons for the recommendation, and (c) suggestions
203 for improvement ~~(if needed)~~ Not Recommended. The Professional Leave Committee
204 shall also submit to the Vice President for Academic Affairs the rank order of
205 applications in the category.

206
207 A copy of this letter shall be given provided to the applicant. The applicant shall be
208 informed ~~that a positive that a~~ recommendation by the Professional Leave Committee
209 does not guarantee that the Sabbatical Leave will be approved by the President.

210
211 **Applicants may respond in writing to the VPAA regarding the committee's**
212 **recommendation within two weeks of receipt of the recommendation.**

- 213
214 B. The Senate Office shall send a copy of the application to the faculty unit employee's department
215 (or equivalent unit). The department (or equivalent unit) shall provide a statement to the Vice
216 President for Academic Affairs (with a copy to the Dean) regarding the possible effect on the
217 curriculum and the operation of the department (or equivalent unit) should the employee be
218 granted a sabbatical.
- 219
220 C. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall make a recommendation to the President
221 regarding each sabbatical leave application.
- 222
223 1. After reviewing the recommendations of the Professional Leave Committee, the Vice
224 President for Academic Affairs may meet and confer with the Professional Leave
225 Committee for clarification.
- 226
227 2. The Vice President for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the appropriate deans,
228 shall consider other campus program needs and campus budget implications. In
229 particular, the distribution of sabbatical leaves among different academic units may be
230 considered (taking into account such factors as the FTES, FTEF, number of eligible
231 faculty, number of faculty applying, and the number of faculty recommended or
232 conditionally recommended by the Professional Leave Committee in each unit).
- 233
234 3. When resources do not allow funding of all sabbatical leaves of a given category or
235 subcategory of recommendation, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall also
236 take into account the number of years (since the applicant's previous sabbatical leave, if
237 any) an applicant has been eligible for sabbatical leave as well as the number of years
238 the applicant has been recommended or conditionally recommended for a sabbatical
239 leave by the Professional Leave Committee, but not awarded.
- 240
241 4. Arrangements may be developed by the department and approved by the President to
242 accommodate granting sabbatical leaves for faculty unit employees whose leaves have
243 been approved. Such arrangements may include rearranging workload within the
244 department, and other university funding. No faculty unit employee will be
245 involuntarily required to work in an overload situation by such arrangements.
- 246
247 5. The recommendation of the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall be forwarded to
248 the President with copies to the applicant, the Dean, the department (or equivalent),
249 and the Professional Leave Committee. The letter should contain reasons for the
250 recommendation.

251
252 VIII. APPROVAL

- 253
254 A. The President or the President's designee shall respond in writing to the applicant and shall
255 include the reasons for approval or denial. If a sabbatical leave is granted, the response shall

256 include any conditions of such a leave. A copy of this response shall be provided to the affected
257 department (or equivalent unit), the Dean, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the
258 Academic Senate Office for the Professional Leave Committee.

- 259
- 260 B. Final approval of a sabbatical leave shall not be granted until the applicant has filed with the
261 President a suitable bond or an accepted statement of assets (not including PERS holdings)
262 and/or a promissory note that is at least equal to the amount of salary paid during the leave.
263
- 264 C. The guarantee posted shall indemnify the State of California against loss in the event the
265 employee fails to render the required service in the CSU following return of the employee from
266 the sabbatical leave.
267
- 268 D. The guarantee posted shall immediately be canceled in full upon completion of required service
269 or upon waiver of that service by mutual agreement of the faculty member and the CSU.
270
- 271 E. A faculty unit employee whose leave requested has been approved shall normally be granted
272 that leave. A leave may be deferred up to one year in circumstances when the President or the
273 President's designee determines that granting the sabbatical leave in the succeeding academic
274 year would cause an undue hardship on the department's ability to offer its program.
275

276 IX. FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

- 277
- 278 A. A faculty unit employee on a sabbatical leave shall not accept additional and/or outside
279 employment without prior approval of the president or the President's designee.
280
- 281 B. A faculty unit employee granted a sabbatical leave may be required by the president to provide
282 verification that conditions of leave were met. The statement of verification shall be provided to
283 the president and the Academic Senate office for the Professional Leave Committee.
284
- 285 C. A faculty unit employee shall render service to the CSU upon return from a sabbatical leave at
286 the rate of one (1) term of service for each term of leave.
287
- 288 D. A faculty member, upon return from sabbatical, shall submit a written report of approximately
289 one page to the department (or equivalent unit) and Dean describing accomplishments during
290 the period of leave.
291

292 X. FACULTY RIGHTS

- 293
- 294 A. It is the intent of this policy that faculty unit employees eligible for sabbatical leave who meet
295 the conditions of this policy receive their sabbatical leave.
296
- 297 B. Faculty on a sabbatical leave may not serve on university-wide committees. However, faculty
298 on a sabbatical leave may vote in university-wide elections and run for university-wide offices for
299 which they are eligible. The voting rights and committee service restrictions of an individual on
300 sabbatical, within their college, department, or program, should be decided by the
301 college/department/program and included in pertinent governance documents.
302
- 303 C. A faculty unit employee on a sabbatical leave shall be considered in work status and shall receive
304 health, dental, and appropriate fringe benefits provided by the CSU in the same manner as if
305 ~~s/he~~ the individual were not on a sabbatical leave.
306
- 307 D. A faculty unit employee on a sabbatical leave shall be entitled to accrue sick leave, vacation, and
308 service credit toward merit salary adjustment, eligibility toward promotion, if applicable, and
309 seniority credit.
310

311 E. If approved leaves are deferred, in succeeding years first preference for leave shall be given to
312 faculty whose leave applications were approved in the earliest prior year.
313

314 XI. TIMELINE

315
316 **May of year before request process begins**

- 317 - Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs - Academic Resources notifies
- 318 eligible faculty
- 319 - NEAC constitutes the Professional Leave Committee.
- 320

321 **Last business day of September**

- 322 - 9 copies of application due in Office of the Academic Senate. (Senate provides 1
- 323 copy to Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and 1 copy to the
- 324 department (or equivalent unit)
- 325

326 **First business day of October**

- 327 - Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs - Academic Resources requests
- 328 impact statement from the department (or equivalent unit)
- 329

330 **Last business day of October**

- 331 - Professional Leave Committee forwards recommendations to Vice President for
- 332 Academic Affairs with a copy to applicant
- 333 - Impact statements due to Vice President for Academic Affairs with a copy to
- 334 applicant
- 335

336 **Last business day of November**

337 ~~— Vice President for Academic Affairs forwards recommendation to President with~~
338 ~~copies to the department (or equivalent unit), the Dean, the Office of the Academic~~
339 ~~Senate for the Professional Leave Committee and the applicant.~~
340

341 **Last day of Fall semester**

- 342 - President or designee notifies candidates of sabbatical decisions with copies to the
- 343 department (or equivalent unit), the Dean and the Office of the Academic Senate for
- 344 the Professional Leave Committee

345 **DRAFT Rating Sheet for Sabbatical Applications**

346 **Applicant's Name:** _____

347
348
349
350 Is the application complete? ___ Yes ___ No

351 ___ a. *Narrative including timeline*

352 ___ b. *Statement of resource needs*

353 ___ d. *Statement of time requested*

354 ___ e. *CV*

355 ___ f. *Copies of original reports on previous sabbaticals*

356 ___ g. *Recommendations from previous recommended but unfunded sabbaticals in previous two*
357 *years (Optional)*

358
359 Type of professional development (check all that apply)

360 ___ Research, scholarly, or creative activity

361 ___ Continuation of ongoing research

362 ___ Change in direction

363 ___ Faculty retraining/renewal

364 ___ Instructional improvement

365 _____ Which courses will benefit
 366 _____ How courses will benefit

367
 368 **For items 1-4 below, rate each criterion using the following scale:**
 369

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

370	1.	The project will enhance the applicant's professional growth and/or positively impact the applicant's ability to carry out responsibilities at CSUSM. <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5
	2.	The project amount of expected professional development is high provides a crucial benefit to the instructional needs of CSUSM (e.g., by keeping faculty up to date in their field, new ideas in the classroom, faculty competency). <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5
	3.	The project is an unusually good or timely opportunity. <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5
	4.	The quality of the application (in terms of clearly presents the clarity, purpose, methods and objectives) is high of the proposed project. <i>Comments:</i>	1	2	3	4	5

371
 372 Overall Comments on the proposal:

373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378 **Proposal ranking** _____

379
 380 _____ Recommended (Exceptionally high quality projects or unusually good or timely opportunities; no
 381 more than 25% of the proposals)

382
 383 _____ Conditionally Recommended (high quality)

384
 385 _____ Not Recommended (not high quality)

386
 387
 388 Suggestions for improvement of the application:

Comparison of Current and Revised Program Review Procedures

OLD VERSION	NEW VERSION
There was no policy as such, document outlined philosophy and procedure.	The new policy with separate guidelines providing procedure and specific instructions.
While student learning outcomes were part of the items to be addressed during program reviews there was no specific reporting of assessment.	Accreditation bodies and the CSU have placed increasing focus on assessment of student learning and reporting. Therefore, assessment reports are incorporated into the program review.
Repeated every 5 years	Assessment is on going. Program review cycle is 5 or 7 years.
Comprehensive review. Department addresses 9 topics, one of which is student learning outcomes. Others are design of degree program, student readiness, graduates, advising, enrollments, pedagogy and instruction, resources, and extracurricular activities.	Content of review begins with reflection on achieving educational objectives (SLO's) on student learning outcomes by examining annual assessment data, followed by a section on developing and allocating resources and concluding with the selection of not more than two additional themes/special interests.
Data Notebook required departmental action	Data Notebook contents identified by department, located by IPA and OPAA Faculty Fellow and provided to the department.
Lack of guidance on structure of narrative.	Includes instructions for report structure and content. Also a model outline is provided (sections VI and VII).
PAC and External Reviewer roles unclear	Clarifies roles of PAC, External Reviewers, and others (sections III).
Little or no specific funding or support.	Support from Learning Outcomes Assessment Fellow on PSLOs and from OPAA Faculty Fellow on data notebook development. Provides resources for faculty conducting annual assessment and self study.
Usually one External Reviewer	Provides for 2 External Reviewers, whenever possible. Includes specific information on selection, visit, and expectations.
Planning report required	Part of narrative includes discussing future goals.
Few specifics on masters programs	Graduate programs included throughout.
Senate receives end of year report.	Senate office receives end-of-year report.
Includes mention of system for ad-hoc committee to review viability of program	Includes recommendations for program continuation comprised of 3 levels of recommendations.
Planning report has only mention of MOU but specifics were vague. The program review report became "baseline" for next PEP.	Includes final meeting and MOU for future goals/developmental plan (section III).
	3/07/11

PAC: Review of Academic Programs

Definition: A policy outlining the responsibilities for and requirements of the CSUSM academic program review, evaluation, and planning process.

Authority:

Scope: All academic degree programs.

I. Preamble

- A. Program Review at the California State University originated with the Chancellor's Office memorandum AP 71-32, "Performance Review of Existing Degree Major Programs," which asks each campus to "establish a formal performance review procedure for all existing degree programs on campus in order to assess periodically both the quantitative and qualitative viability of each undergraduate and graduate program in the total context of offerings." A summary of the program review is sent to the Chancellor's Office by the Associate Vice President of Planning, Accreditation, and Assessment (AVP-PAA).
- B. The intention of Program Review is to open and maintain dialogue among the program faculty and between all of the parties (the academic unit and various administrative offices, etc.) whose cooperation is necessary for the delivery of a high-quality academic degree program.
- C. In adopting this policy, the Academic Senate acknowledges the serious investments in time and effort involved and stands committed to making assessment and sustaining program quality as important aspects of the campus culture.

II. Definition of terms and abbreviations

- A. Academic unit
 1. Refers to the department, program, school, or college that oversees the curriculum for a degree program.
- B. Academic degree programs
 1. Refers specifically to baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral degree programs.
 2. Program review will focus on both the academic unit's capacity to deliver the program as well as the educational effectiveness of the degree program.
 - a. When colleges/schools or departments manage more than one academic degree, each degree program shall undergo a separate review.
 - b. It is expected, however, that major sections of the self-study report may be duplicated when more than one degree program is reviewed in the same department or program.

III. Principles:

- A. The program review process will be central to academic planning, budget, and decisions about allocation of resources.
- B. The program review process will not duplicate, but rather will build upon, other campus-wide processes or reporting activities such as annual assessment reports, annual departmental reports, and strategic planning documents.
- C. Program review helps to identify strengths, challenges, opportunities for improvement, and provides a chance to plan for the future. It is only useful to the extent that it is a systematic, developmental, ongoing process of inquiry conducted by academic programs that includes data from annual assessments.
- D. The value of program review derives, in part, from the use of results in programmatic, collegiate and institutional planning, and in resource allocation decisions to meet program needs and help program to improve, especially where correctable weaknesses can be identified.
- E. One outcome of the review process is a plan specifying goals and strategies for program improvement and student learning assessment. This represents the formative, developmental, and planning phase of the process, once the summative stage, in the form of various reviewers' recommendations, has passed. For the next cycle of review, this plan becomes an important point of focus. In time, as current reviews build upon their predecessors, program review, learning assessment, and curriculum development should become a significant and altogether routine aspect of life at CSUSM.

- 56 F. Recognizing that program review is labor-intensive and time-consuming, this Academic Senate policy
57 aims to ensure that the process operates under a realistic timeline and that it is sensitive to the effort
58 required. In order to fulfill this commitment, resources must be provided for annual assessment
59 projects, the development of the self study, and the external reviewers. The Provost's office will provide
60 resources for annual assessment projects, external reviewers, and the resources to support faculty in the
61 development of the self-study. Should budget constraints impact support for program review processes,
62 appropriate adjustments will be made in program review expectations and processes.
63

64 **IV. Program Review Responsibility**

- 65 A. Department/Program (hereafter referred to as department)
- 66 1. The responsibility for carrying out the program review process lies with faculty that deliver the
67 curriculum for the particular degree program, and they are assisted in this endeavor by CSUSM
68 staff and administration.
 - 69 2. The department will conduct a candid self-study examining departmental goals and
70 accomplishments (including progress on accomplishing goals set forth in the previous review's
71 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), and reviewing the results of annual assessment of student
72 learning outcomes and suggestions from Office of Planning, Accreditation, and Assessment (OPAA)
73 in response to these reports.
 - 74 a. The self-study will include discussion of the student learning outcomes and assessments, as
75 well as the program's currency, capacity, and academic integrity as outlined in the program
76 review procedures.
 - 77 b. For specific self-study guidelines, see the *CSUSM Guidelines for Program Review*
- 78 B. College Deans⁴
- 79 1. Deans or their designees are responsible for working with the OPAA to assure the timely
80 completion of the program review.
 - 81 2. Deans review the self-study for completeness and accuracy prior to the external review visit.
 - 82 3. Deans provide evaluative comments on the self-study after receipt of the external reviewer report.
 - 83 4. Deans participate in the development of the MOU.
- 84
- 85 C. The Program Assessment Committee of Academic Senate (PAC)
- 86 The PAC is responsible for overseeing the program review process, for the final response to the
87 department, including recommendations for five or seven-year review cycles, for recommendations
88 regarding program continuation, for meeting with those who develop the MOU, and for reporting to the
89 Academic Senate.
- 90 D. Institutional Planning and Assessment (IPA)
- 91 1. IPA is responsible for providing timely and accurate data to each program undergoing review.
 - 92 2. IPA is available to provide support and expertise for programs that wish to conduct surveys for
93 data collection purposes.
- 94 E. Administrative Support
- 95 1. The Office of Academic Planning and Accreditation (OPAA) provides administrative support for the
96 entire process. OPAA is also responsible for reporting the results of program review to the
97 Chancellor's Office.
 - 98 2. The AVP-PAA will confer with the College Deans and with the Dean of Graduate Studies (DGS) for
99 reviews of graduate programs.
- 100
- 101 F. Provost
- 102 1. As the Chief Academic Officer, the Provost is ultimately responsible for the entire program review
103 process and reviews and responds to all reports.

104 **V. Review Cycles**

- 105 A. The program review process at CSUSM runs on a five or seven year cycle.
- 106 B. The schedule for program review is published in the Academic Master Plan.
- 107

⁴ The term "College Deans" also refers to administrative equivalents, such as Director of a school.

- 108 C. Generally, reviews of graduate programs will be scheduled at the same time as the review of the
109 undergraduate program(s) within the same discipline. Departments may submit a request to the PAC,
110 OPAA, and DGS to separate undergraduate and graduate reviews.
111 D. For programs that undergo accreditation, care will be taken to coordinate program review with
112 accreditation cycles for the discipline (See Section VI of this policy).
113 E. In the case of new programs, a developmental period of up to five years will be allowed before the first
114 program review.
115
- 116 VI. Periodic Review of Accredited Programs
117 A. Any currently accredited academic program may request to substitute the accreditation report for the
118 self study and external review. This request is made to the OPAA.
119 B. Documents prepared for accreditation, visits from the accreditation body, and reports from the
120 accreditation body will normally be accepted as satisfying components of the self-study report in whole
121 or in part if the accreditation report includes a discussion of assessment and student learning outcomes.
122 C. Substitution of an accreditation report for a program review will only be permitted if annual assessment
123 plans and reports have been submitted by the program during the period prior to the accreditation
124 process.
- 125 VII. External Review
126 A. Except for unusual situations approved by the AVP-PAA, the DGS (for graduate programs only) and the
127 PAC, external review will be part of all program reviews.
128 B. Sufficient funds to cover the expense of the external reviews will be included in the budget of the
129 University.
130 C. For specific guidelines, see the *CSUSM Guidelines for Program Review*.
131
- 132 VIII. Concluding the Program Review Process
133 A. The Chancellor's Office receives a summary statement of the assessment section of the self-study,
134 including information about how assessment results have been used to improve the academic degree
135 program.
136 B. The actual program review reports remain on campus in the OPAA, online as part of the Program
137 Portfolios, and are the foundation for the next program review.
138 C. After the faculty of the academic program, the College Dean, and the Provost (or designee), have had an
139 opportunity to study all reports and recommendations, representatives of these three areas and the chair
140 of PAC will meet to discuss recommendations and agree on actions to be taken.
141 1. Based on this conversation, the AVP-PAA will draft a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that
142 all parties will sign, which will be in effect until the completion of the next review cycle. The MOU is
143 an opportunity for all to agree on a set of desired developmental goals, subject to a corresponding
144 agreement about necessary resources and their availability.
145 2. This MOU will be used in future planning, budget, and resource allocation processes.
146 3. Where consensus cannot be achieved, as determined by the AVP-PAA the parties will file
147 separate memoranda outlining their difference in views. These differences will be reviewed
148 by the Senate Chair or his/her designee and the Provost or his/her designee who will work
149 with the involved parties until consensus is reached.
150 4. It is understood that College Deans will seek advice related to the MOU from appropriate college
151 governance committees.
152 5. For specific guidelines, see the *CSUSM Guidelines for Program Review*.
153

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
Between the ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE
And the DEAN OF GRADUATE STUDIES for
COORDINATION OF TASKS BETWEEN APC AND GSC
Beginning AY 2011/12

The Academic Policy Committee (APC) is a standing committee of the Academic Senate. It is responsible for developing academic policies for undergraduate and graduate students. The Graduate Studies Council (GSC) is a group of graduate program coordinators who meet on regular basis to advise the Dean of Graduate Studies. GSC is not a standing committee of the Academic Senate; however, in the past, GSC has taken responsibility for drafting academic policies governing graduate students. This memorandum of understanding will formalize the relationship between APC and GSC so that smooth coordination of the two groups can occur, and so that the Senate's role in developing academic policies is maintained.

Starting in AY 2011/12, APC and GSC shall use the following steps to coordinate their tasks:

1. Dean of Graduate Studies will notify APC **in writing** that GSC will be drafting a policy. This must **include the rationale** for creating/modifying the policy.
2. APC will review the rationale and present it to EC to receive a referral for APC to work on it.
3. EC makes a referral to APC.
4. APC requests that GSC draft a policy.
5. GSC drafts the policy.
6. The Dean of Graduate Studies and/or a designated member from GSC will bring a policy draft to APC. This must **include the names** of people who were involved in drafting the policy. This must also **include the rationale** for creating/modifying the policy.
7. APC will review the policy draft and **work with GSC** to make improvements as needed.
8. APC will bring the final policy draft to EC and then later to the Senate.
9. APC will forward comments from EC/Senate to GSC and **will work closely with GSC** to make improvements as needed.

This agreement shall be reviewed again by all parties (APC Chair, Dean of Graduate Studies, and Senate Chair) in the Fall semester of 2012. This document and any modifications will be kept on file in the Academic Senate Office.

The parties who sign below are also signing this agreement on behalf of the future APC Chairs, the Deans of Graduate Studies and the Senate Chairs.

Academic Policy Committee, Chair

Date

Dean of Graduate Studies

Date

Academic Senate Chair

Date