

1 San José State University
2 Academic Senate
3 Curriculum and Research Committee
4 May 15, 2017
5 Final Reading
6

AS 1652

7 **Policy Recommendation:**
8 **Organization of the Program Planning Process at San José State**
9 **University**

10
11 **Rescinds S94-2, S96-10, and F03-4**
12

13 **Whereas:** The program planning process is mandated by Resolution REP 71-07 of the
14 CSU Board of Trustees ("Performance Review of Existing Degree Major
15 Programs"); and
16

17 **Whereas:** There are a significant number of inconsistencies and inaccuracies in the current
18 process with respect to policies; and
19

20 **Whereas:** The process has not been updated in over 10 years; and
21

22 **Whereas:** The 2015 evaluation by WASC included recommendations for the program
23 planning procedures on campus. Therefore, be it resolved that
24

25 **Resolved:** The following document, "ORGANIZATION OF THE PROGRAM PLANNING
26 PROCESS AT SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY," be adopted as policy effective
27 AY 2017-2018.
28

29 **Approved:** May 8, 2017

30 **Vote:** 12-0-0

31 **Present:** Anagnos, Buzanski, Chang, Cargill, Chung, Heil, Matoush, Medrano, Mathur,
32 Rodan, Stacks, Trulio

33 **Absent:** Grindstaff
34

35 **Curricular Impact:** None anticipated.

36 **Financial Impact:** None anticipated.

37 **Workload Impact:** There is an expected short-term increase in staff time and data
38 development within the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics.
39 There will be increased workload linked to staffing of the Program
40 Planning committee from the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate
41 Programs. There is an anticipated reduction in workload for all programs.
42

43 (followed by new policy on clean page)

44

45

46 ORGANIZATION OF THE PROGRAM PLANNING 47 PROCESS AT SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY

48

49

50 I. Authorization of Program Planning

51

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

57

58 II. Program Planning Goals

59

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

66

67 The four key goals of the Program Planning process are:

68

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

71

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

74

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

79

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

82

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

84

85 A. Charge: The Program Planning Committee (PPC) is responsible for the implementation
86 of the academic program planning process, as provided in this program planning policy,

87 and recommends to the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) changes in the
88 policy, review guidelines, and other matters relating to program planning and review.
89

90 B. Membership:

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

- 92 i. Office of the Provost designee (EXO)
- 93 ii. Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs designee (EXO)
- 94 iii. Office of Research designee (EXO)
- 95 iv. Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics designee (EXO)
- 96 v. Director of Assessment (EXO)
- 97 vi. Two Faculty Members from Applied Sciences and Arts
- 98 vii. Two Faculty Members from Business
- 99 viii. Two Faculty Members from Education
- 100 ix. Two Faculty Members from Engineering
- 101 x. Two Faculty Members from Humanities and the Arts
- 102 xi. Two Faculty Members from Science
- 103 xii. Two Faculty Members from Social Science
- 104 xiii. One Faculty Member from the General Unit
- 105 xiv. One Graduate Student
- 106 xv. One Undergraduate Student
- 107 xvi. GUP Staff Member (Non-voting)

108
109 C. Recruitment and Appointment of Members: Faculty members (other than ex-officio)
110 shall be appointed for two-year staggered terms. The student members serve a 1-year
111 term. Solicitation of applications to serve on the Program Planning Committee will be
112 made through the normal Committee on Committees process for the seats designated
113 for faculty and student members. When multiple applications are submitted for a seat,
114 the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will select individuals to serve. In
115 considering applicants, attention should focus on the person's expertise in areas related
116 to curriculum and program planning and the need for continuity over time in membership
117 for a portion of the seats.

- 118 i. The committee shall elect its chair from the faculty representatives by majority vote.
- 119 ii. All members, except as noted, shall be voting members of the committee.
- 120 iii. Members may be replaced for excessive absences or nonperformance according to
121 section 6.12 of University Policy S16-11.

122
123 D. Responsibilities of PPC:

- 124 i. The PPC reports and conveys its recommendations on the Program Planning
125 Guidelines and process to C&R.
- 126 ii. PPC will maintain confidentiality of materials including all information provided to
127 outside accreditation agencies or to outside reviewers, as specified in the Program
128 Planning Guidelines.
- 129 iii. PPC will establish its operating procedures as needed.
- 130 iv. PPC is responsible for the review of all departmental program plans.

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

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

136

137 **IV. Scope of the Program Planning Process**

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

140

141 A. All undergraduate and graduate degree major programs.

142 B. Credential programs.

143 C. GE and service courses offered within the department.

144 D. Minor programs offered within the department.

145

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

148

149 F. Certificates offered within the department.

150

151 **V. The Process for Program Planning**

152

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

158

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

161

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

166

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

172

173 E. In general, academic units with both graduate and undergraduate programs are
174 reviewed in the same cycle, except in special circumstances (e.g., different external
175 accreditation cycles).
176

177 **VI. Evaluation of the Program Plan, Feedback, and Final Action Plan**
178

179 A. The program plan is evaluated by the PPC which determines whether the review
180 process was conducted in accordance with the published Program Planning Guidelines,
181 and whether the plan represents a reasonable effort to meet the future needs of the
182 students, faculty, and community. The Board of General Studies (BOGS) is responsible
183 for evaluating the General Education portion of the self-study.
184

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

- 187 • Accept the plan and provide recommendations to be discussed at the action plan
188 meeting.
- 189 • Require revisions and resubmission of the plan for specific reasons.
- 190 • Initiate a program termination review (See Senate Policy S06-7, S13-9) for specific
191 reasons.
192

193 C. The PPC prepares a Letter to the Provost summarizing their findings and
194 recommendations. This letter is copied to the program, C&R, and designated
195 administrative individuals. Programs have the opportunity to review and correct any
196 factual inaccuracies in this letter.
197

198 D. For program plans that are approved, an action plan meeting is established and
199 facilitated by the chair of the PPC. Invitees to this meeting include the Provost or
200 designee, AVP of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs, AVP of Academic Budgets
201 and Planning, Department chair, faculty and staff of the program, Dean and Associate
202 Deans of the respective college, and additional administrators suggested by the Provost,
203 chair of the program, or chair of PPC.
204

205 E. At the meeting, representatives from the academic units provide updates since program
206 review and clarifications to the Letter to the Provost. Participants at the meeting discuss
207 the recommendations in the Letter to the Provost and any additional items. Participants
208 agree to a final action plan with measureable goals for their next program plan cycle.
209 The Director of Assessment will communicate to the Board of General Studies items
210 from the final action plan related to General Education.
211

212 F. After this meeting, the draft action plan (with clear deadlines) will be reviewed by the
213 department, dean, and PPC chair for any inaccuracies and to ensure it reflects the
214 action plan meeting discussion.
215

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

- 218
- 219 A. Programs are required to provide annual assessment updates between full reviews.
220 These updates are to the Director of Assessment. Two separate assessments occur:
221 one for GE courses within a program, and a second one for student learning and
222 achievement of the overall program learning outcomes.
223
- 224 B. The assessment forms are created by the college assessment facilitators and the
225 Director of Assessment.
226
- 227 C. The Director of Assessment reviews these reports and provides feedback to programs in
228 between their program planning cycles.
229