Committee on Academic Planning and Review  
End of Year Report 2005-2006

The Committee met as required on the first and third Tuesday of each month between 2-3:50 p.m. In order to reduce the backlog from previous years, the committee met every Thursday, including during Finals week, during the academic year. Meeting dates for the Academic Year 2005-06 were: September 29, October 6, October 13, October 20, October 27, November 3, November 10, November 17, December 1, December 8, January 5, January 12, January 19, January 21, January 28, February 2, February 9, February 16, February 23, March 2, March 9, March 30, April 6, April 13, April 20, April 27, May 4, May 11, May 18, and May 25.

Members for the academic year 2005-06 included: Judy Clarence, Library; Farnaz Ganjeizadeh, Engineering; Kim Geron, Political Science; Vish Hegde, Management and Finance; Roseann Hogan Institutional Research; Michelle La Centra, Academic Programs; Sally Murphy, Communication/General Education Office; Julie Norton, Statistics; Janet Patterson, Communicative Speech Disorders; Asha Rao, Management and Finance; Linda Smetana, Teacher Education; and. During the Fall Quarter we had two active student representatives, Rebecca Sweet and Robert Norton. During the Spring Quarter Stephen Miller, Management and Finance replaced Vish Hegde and Robert Norton (student representative) returned.

We approved and sent to the Senate through the Executive Committee:
1. Name change of Special Major programs to Interdisciplinary Studies
2. New BA degree program in Biochemistry
3. Proposed guide lines for proposals for changing names of organizational units
4. New MS degree program in Biostatistics
5. Name change from the Department of Statistics to the Department of Statistics and Biostatistics
6. 

Received and/or finalized the following Academic Reviews:
1. French/Spanish Program Review
2. Multimedia Program Review 5
3. International Studies Program
4. Communication and Speech Disorders
5. History
6. Physics
7. Geology
8. Statistics
9. Nursing
10. Art carried
11. Geography and Environmental Studies
12. Biology
13. Marine Science
14. Environmental Science
15. Mathematics
16. Computer Science
17. Psychology
18. Theater
19. Health Care Admin
20. Economics
21. Music

Granted delays for the following programs:
1. Latin American Studies until Fall 2006 when a plan for integration with Ethnic Studies should be presented to CAPR
2. Ethnic Studies until Fall 2006
3. Human Development until Fall 2006
4. Liberal Studies with a draft report submitted until Fall 2006

Granted short term delays for the following programs:
1. Health Sciences will be drafted late Spring by CAPR and carried forward to Fall 2006
2. Environmental Science Review completed after brief delay
3. Music completed after delay of outside reviewer

Considered the following CAPR policy issues:
1. Tenure-track hiring timeline and program review revisions. To be reviewed in two years. Approved by the Senate
2. Program review for Extension Programs and Program Review for General Education, agreeing that both programs should have an Academic Review and scheduling a review for General Education to coincide with the next scheduled CIC review in 2007-09
3. Followed through this year with the inclusion of library visits within each program review, suggesting the outside reviewers should visit the library and the discipline librarian during the regularly scheduled program review. CAPR should review this process and consider a separate review at a later time

Ongoing work: The annual reports are a mechanism to hold departments and the administration jointly accountable for academic program quality.
1. Review Modern Languages annual report and give a brief report to EXCOM
2. Review Geological Sciences annual report with an eye to the MS program graduates and report to EXCOM

Suggestions to next CAPR:
1. Consider Extension and Contra Costa program reviews
2. Secretary should be loaned a laptop for minutes
3. Projection of reviews under consideration so that revisions can be made in a timely manner on laptop at meetings when documents are discussed

Once again we hope that this is the last review period where academic reviews are not clearly linked to resource allocation issues. A large part of our work this past year was to synthesize the rubrics and guidelines of previous CAPR and faculty units. Indeed our work with the timeline and to complete the tenure track hiring guidelines and to incorporate these with all of the
University documents on hiring practices was directed toward this goal of building a set of materials that can be more easily evaluated and provide more transparency for programs undergoing program review. In ongoing reviews we are using results to revise our processes to inform programs and the University about the quality of its programs in such a way that there is a structure built around the Academic Program Review so that these are useful and do not result in work that just goes on the shelf.

Our ability to evaluate the quality of our programs has not always been clear, either for CAPR members or for programs undergoing review. Some of the changes that we and previous CAPR committees have undertaken include clearer procedures and more carefully linked resource implications to the review process. Making the link clearer makes the importance of the academic review more apparent to the programs under review. As we struggled through twenty reviews this year, we used what we learned in the review process to more clearly detail our procedures. For example, evaluating Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) can be difficult for those outside the field. We implemented the SLO rubric from previous years WASC subcommittee. We also implemented an Outside Reviewer Rubric.

In receiving the first year annual reports, CAPR should review reports from programs with delays and those with CAPR oversight. Next years CAPR should propose ways to ensure that the review plans and agreements should be evaluated.

There is a range of programs and a range of review procedures that programs undergo, from licensing, accreditation, and credentialing to internal reviews. We need to provide review for the entire spectrum of programs and our procedures need to reflect the diversity that is present at the University. At the Senate discussion the College of Business and Economics particularly thought that our processes do not serve them well. When the processes are studied again in a two years time, we hope that the issues of concern presented by the College of Business and Economics will be particularly addressed. Some references to Departments rather than programs remain in the revised document and need to be addressed as well.

We met weekly to complete our work as completely as possible. The Chair wishes to commend the committee for outstanding citizenship. All committee members were dedicated and involved with the program review process. The Chair needs also to thank the three members who served as secretary and acted as Chair for the meetings where the Chair was absent. These secretaries were Janet Patterson, Fall Quarter; Asha Rao, Winter Quarter; and Judy Clarence Spring Quarter.

Julia Norton
CAPR Chair 2005-2006