SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
ONE WASHINGTON SQUARE
SAN JOSÉ, CA 95192

S17-11, University Policy, Organization of the Program Planning Process at SJSU

Legislative History:

At its meeting of May 15, 2017, the Academic Senate approved the following policy recommendation presented by Senator Mathur for Curriculum and Research Committee. The program planning process is mandated by Resolution REP 71-07 of the CSU Board of Trustees ("Performance Review of Existing Degree Major Programs"). There are a significant number of inconsistencies and inaccuracies in the current process. The 2015 WASC evaluation included recommendations that are incorporated into the policy below. University Policy S17-11 was approved and signed by President Mary A. Papazian on August 1, 2017.

On September 11, 2019, President Mary A. Papazian approved University Policy S19-2. S19-2 is Amendment A to University Policy S17-11, and updated the charge of the Program Planning Committee and is incorporated into the policy below.

On May 4, 2020, President Mary A. Papazian approved and signed Amendment B to University Policy S17-11. Amendment B further modified the membership of the Program Planning Committee by replacing the seats formerly assigned to the IEA Director with the Director of Institutional Research.

On May 10, 2021, President Mary A. Papazian approved and signed Amendment C to University Policy S17-11. Amendment C modifies the membership of the Program Planning Committee as follows: Seat A (III.B.i) is changed from "Office of the Provost" to "Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Analytics;" Seat B (III.B.ii) from "Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education designee" to "Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education or designee;" and Seat D (III.B.iv) is changed from "Director of Institutional Research or designee" to "Dean of Graduate Studies or designee." Amendments A, B, and C are incorporated into University Policy S17-11 below.

Rescinds and Replaces: S94-2, S96-10, and F03-4

University Policy
Organization of the Program Planning Process at
San José State University

Whereas: The program planning process is mandated by Resolution REP 71-07 of the CSU Board of Trustees ("Performance Review of Existing Degree Major Programs"); and

Whereas: There are a significant number of inconsistencies and inaccuracies in the current process with respect to policies; and

Whereas: The process has not been updated in over 10 years; and

Whereas: The 2015 evaluation by WASC included recommendations for the program planning procedures on campus. Therefore, be it resolved that

Resolved: The following document, "ORGANIZATION OF THE PROGRAM PLANNING PROCESS AT SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY," be adopted as policy effective AY 2017-2018.

Resolved: That implementation timeline for program planning review for programs starting in AY 2017-2018 will be determined by the AVP of GUP. All other programs will follow the established timelines.

Approved: May 8, 2017
Vote: 12-0-0
Present: Anagnos, Buzanski, Chang, Cargill, Chung, Heil, Matoush, Medrano, Mathur, Rodan, Stacks, Trulio
Absent: Grindstaff
Curricular Impact: None anticipated.
Financial Impact: None anticipated.
Workload Impact: There is an expected short-term increase in staff time and data development within the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics. There will be increased workload linked to staffing of the Program Planning committee from the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs. There is an anticipated reduction in workload for all programs.

ORGANIZATION OF THE PROGRAM PLANNING PROCESS AT SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY

I. Authorization of Program Planning

San José State University continually monitors, updates, and improves its curriculum through the *program planning process*. While this process is mandated by a Trustee policy as found in the Chancellor's Memorandum AA 71-32,"Performance Review of Existing Degree Major Programs," SJSU's implementation of the process is also independently authorized, augmented, and supported through this policy.

II. Program Planning Goals

Program Planning represents an opportunity for each program's faculty to improve their ability to accomplish goals that attract them to their profession, including educating students, advancing their discipline, and serving the community. By embracing rigorous internal and external examination of their program, faculty gain the perspective necessary to adapt to changing conditions, promote department health, and to provide an excellent quality education for their students.

The four key goals of the Program Planning process are:

1) To promote a continuous internal review and planning process that will provide programs with purposeful future improvement.

2) To serve as a vehicle to help programs support the mission of the university, college, and department.

3) To provide an opportunity for programs to systematically assess their course offerings, achievement of student learning outcomes, student success, retention and graduation rates, and the faculty and instructional resources necessary for providing an excellent educational experience to students.

4) To provide an opportunity for programs to review their complementary activities and how these activities strengthen the program and its goals.

III. Establishment of the Program Planning Committee and its tasks.

A. <u>Charge:</u> Implements the academic program planning process, including the review of programs, as provided in the program planning policy and guidelines. Recommends changes in the policy and guidelines and other matters relating to program planning and review to the Curriculum and Research Committee.

B. Membership:
The Program Planning Committee (PPC) shall be made up of the following members:

i. Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Analytics (EXO)
ii. Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education or designee (EXO)
iii. Office of AVP Research (EXO)
iv. Dean of Graduate Studies or designee (EXO)
v. Director of Assessment (EXO)
vi. Two Faculty Members from Health and Human Sciences
vii. Two Faculty Members from Business
viii. Two Faculty Members from Education
ix. Two Faculty Members from Engineering
x. Two Faculty Members from Humanities and the Arts
xi. Two Faculty Members from Science
xii. Two Faculty Members from Social Science
xiii. Two members from the General Unit
xiv. One Graduate Student
xv. One Undergraduate Student
xvi. Staff Member (Non-voting)

C. Recruitment and Appointment of Members: Faculty members (other than ex-officio) shall be appointed for two-year staggered terms. The student members serve a 1-year term. Solicitation of applications to serve on the Program Planning Committee will be made through the normal Committee on Committees process for the seats designated for faculty and student members. When multiple applications are submitted for a seat, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will select individuals to serve. In considering applicants, attention should focus on the person's expertise in areas related to curriculum and program planning and the need for continuity over time in membership for a portion of the seats.

i. The committee shall elect its chair from the faculty representatives by majority vote.

ii. All members, except as noted, shall be voting members of the committee.

iii. Members may be replaced for excessive absences or nonperformance according to section 6.12 of University Policy S16-11.

D. Responsibilities of PPC:
i. The PPC reports and conveys its recommendations on the Program Planning Guidelines and process to C&R.

ii. PPC will maintain confidentiality of materials including all information provided to outside accreditation agencies or to outside reviewers, as specified in the Program Planning Guidelines.

iii. PPC will establish its operating procedures as needed.

iv. PPC is responsible for the review of all departmental program plans.

v. Both C&R and PPC can propose changes to the *Program Planning Guidelines*. C&R has final approval of these guidelines and conducts a full review at least once every five years.

vi. Members are expected to know the current review guidelines and program planning policy.

IV. Scope of the Program Planning Process

Program Planning includes both state-support and self-support programs. Each department will conduct a review of at least the following elements:

A.   All undergraduate and graduate degree major programs.

B.   Credential programs.

C.   GE and service courses offered within the department.

D.   Minor programs offered within the department.

E.   A minor degree program (outside the department) specified and required by a major degree program.

F.   Certificates offered within the department.

V. The Process for Program Planning

A.   Programs that are not subject to external accreditation undergo a program planning review every seven years (measured from the beginning of the cycle). Accredited programs will undergo a program planning review within a year after the completion of an accreditation review. Programs with accreditation cycles of eight years or more will also complete a program planning mid-cycle progress review.

B.   The overall program planning process shall take no longer than four semesters to complete and will be organized by the Graduate and Undergraduate Programs Office.

C. Reviews by external accreditation agencies are considered the equivalent of an external reviewer evaluation, provided that such reviews address all criteria of the program planning guidelines. PPC will make the final decision as to whether the criteria of the guidelines are met.

D. Programs that undergo external accreditation prepare a program planning self-study using a template provided by the PPC that maps the accreditation self-study onto the Program Planning Self Study Guidelines. If any components specified in the Program Planning Guidelines are missing from the accreditation self-study, programs will need to provide them.

E. In general, academic units with both graduate and undergraduate programs are reviewed in the same cycle, except in special circumstances (e.g., different external accreditation cycles).

VI. Evaluation of the Program Plan, Feedback, and Final Action Plan

A. The program plan is evaluated by the PPC which determines whether the review process was conducted in accordance with the published Program Planning Guidelines, and whether the plan represents a reasonable effort to meet the future needs of the students, faculty, and community. The Board of General Studies (BOGS) is responsible for evaluating the General Education portion of the self-study.

B. After its evaluation of the program plan and BOGS review, the PPC may recommend one of the following actions:

- Accept the plan and provide recommendations to be discussed at the action plan meeting.
- Require revisions and resubmission of the plan for specific reasons.
- Initiate a program termination review (See University Policy S06-7, S13-9) for specific reasons.

C. The PPC prepares a Letter to the Provost summarizing their findings and recommendations. This letter is copied to the program, C&R, and designated administrative individuals. Programs have the opportunity to review and correct any factual inaccuracies in this letter.

D. For program plans that are approved, an action plan meeting is established and facilitated by the chair of the PPC. Invitees to this meeting include the Provost or designee, AVP of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs, AVP of Academic Budgets and Planning, Department chair, faculty and staff of the program, Dean and Associate Deans of the respective college, and additional administrators suggested by the Provost, chair of the program, or chair of PPC.

E.   At the meeting, representatives from the academic units provide updates since program review and clarifications to the Letter to the Provost. Participants at the meeting discuss the recommendations in the Letter to the Provost and any additional items. Participants agree to a final action plan with measureable goals for their next program plan cycle. The Director of Assessment will communicate to the Board of General Studies items from the final action plan related to General Education.

F.   After this meeting, the draft action plan (with clear deadlines) will be reviewed by the department, dean, and PPC chair for any inaccuracies and to ensure it reflects the action plan meeting discussion.

VII. Annual Assessment Reporting of General Education and Program Learning Outcomes

A.   Programs are required to provide annual assessment updates between full reviews. These updates are to the Director of Assessment. Two separate assessments occur: one for GE courses within a program, and a second one for student learning and achievement of the overall program learning outcomes.

B.   The assessment forms are created by the college assessment facilitators and the Director of Assessment.

C.   The Director of Assessment reviews these reports and provides feedback to programs in between their program planning cycles.