

**California State University, East Bay
Committee on Academic Planning & Review
DRAFT Meeting Minutes**

Thursday, October 18, 2012

Attending: Sharon Green (Secretary), Dana Edwards, John Eros, Caron Inouye, Saeid Motavalli, Sue Opp, Xeno Rasmusson, Glen Taylor, Amber MacNamara, Julie Beck, Andrew Wong

Members Absent: Chris Chamberlain

Guests in Attendance: Jiansheng Guo, Associate Dean CLASS; Sophie Rollins, Academic Senate; Shoji Fujiwara, Takashi Oura, and Hirofumi Yamada, visiting from from the Fukuoka Institute of Technology in Japan and hosted by Amber Machamer, AVP of Planning and Institutional Research for the purpose of studying our Institutional Research processes.

I. Meeting called to order

- a. Green is serving as chair (Chamberlain is at a conference)

II. Recognition of visitors

III. Minutes amended

- i. P. 3: should read “we did NOT”
- ii. P. 4 part C: nursing should be added to five-year review calendar. Should say ‘Nursing’(Edwards)”
- b. Amended Minutes approved (Edwards/Inouye)

IV. Report from the Chair

V. New Business

- a. **Item 6a:** Assignment list was reviewed. It was observed that Caron has too many programs and the recommendation was made that she be given one less. Julie Beck will work with Ethnic Studies.
- b. Clarification: the term “pending” was clarified. To be clarified in the future: will Geology and Environmental Science be submitting one document or two?
- c. It was suggested that programs might not be getting sufficient “heads-up” that they are due for document submission. There is a need for liasons to get in contact with 13-14 programs now. This will be discussed over the next couple of meetings.
- d. The following assignments were discussed:
 - i. Saeid → hospitality, business administration
 - ii. Glenn → communication
 - iii. Xeno → public administration
 - iv. John → French and Spanish
 - v. Julie/Andrew → computer engineering
 - vi. Dana → anthropology
 - vii. Caron → environmentl studies and geology
 - viii. Sharon → construction management

- ix. Chris → athletics
- e. **Item 6b:** Discussion of Annual Assessment Cycle:
 - i. Concern: Programs are not submitting documentation in a timely manner. Documentation is problematic: program reviews are not reporting on assessment. CAPR needs to function as a support structure.
 - ii. In the fall, the programs need to examine their learning outcomes and create curriculum road maps, if they don't have them.
 - iii. Green: it is important to set up a process because institutional learning outcomes are now in place. PLOs need to be revisited and developed by the faculty of a program as a whole. In order for assessment to be effective, it must be shown where a LO is achieved, throughout the program. Guo said that some programs have done curricular programs, and some have not.
 - iv. Green proposed the following timetable. Fall: PLOs are determined; Winter: assessments are articulated; Spring: results can be demonstrated.
 - v. CSU Chico's program review system was examined, including the guidelines and schedule for academic program review. This might be used as an example of a matrix.
 - vi. Motion that we adopt this language in the academic review procedures (Opp/Taylor). Edwards asked if we should wait and work with one group specifically. Opp stated that the council will work with the deans; Faculty Assessment Coordinators (FACs) will work with the programs. CAPR is intended to be "accountability ensurers" as opposed to an "enforcement body." Green stated that it was up to us as faculty define our procedures and that it was required of us to do assessment. Taylor observed that it is critical that faculty are involved (FACs). Guo observed that FACs are resources, and not intended to do the job for the departments. Taylor observed that there is a definition of "assessment," for faculty who are unfamiliar and that we need a culture of assessment as opposed to something be laid on us.
 - vii. Green suggested that there be a #4 on the Annual Assessment Cycle of Program Learning Outcomes, that CAPR provides a review and feedback as part of the process. Rasmusson observed that our feedback is intended to serve as a critique, rather than giving the sense of an outside body imposing mandates. Green suggested that we find a way to showcase exemplary programs.
 - viii. Green stated that some CSUs have a Day of Learning and Assessment early in the year. Departments come together and assess their plans for the year. This would be a university-wide event.

- f. **Item 6c:** Consideration of Math and Computer Science document
 - i. Opp: it doesn't look like assessment is done; recommends that CAPR require assessment data each year. Green said that some members of the senate may not agree with this document going forward. Opp recommended that the document "continue with modification."
(Opp/Rasmusson) Passed; 1 abstention.
 - g. **Item 6d:** It was observed that programs have several years' notice before they are due to submit documents. There was a request to delay dates for five-year reviews due this year. Motion to deny this request passes (Opp/Rasmusson). It is observed that there is a mechanism for individual programs to request delays.
 - h. **Item 6e:** Request made that we consider the impact of 11-12 CAPR 19 on DCIE programs. CAPR asked for a report to be submitted. It will be submitted. Green suggested that this be made a formal request (more than an email) so that it can be raised and addressed. There is also overlap with COBRA and CIC
 - i. Green observed that we had only made it through new business and that it was critical that everyone review documents prior to meetings.
- VI. Adjournment (Taylor/Rasmusson)