

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

Thursday, November 1, 2012

Attending: Chris Chamberlain (Chair), Sharon Green (Secretary), Dana Edwards, John Eros, Saeid Motavalli, Xeno Rasmusson, Glen Taylor, Donna Wiley, Andrew Wong (substituting for Julie Beck)

Members Absent: Caron Inouye, Sue Opp

Guests in Attendance: Tamra Donnelly, Jiansheng Guo (Associate Dean, CLASS), Amber Machamer (Associate VP, Planning & Institutional Research), Mitch Watnik (Senate Chair), Sophie Rollins (Coordinator, Academic Senate), Kaameelah Wesley (Ass. Coordinator, Academic Senate)

1. Introductions
2. Chair Chamberlain called meeting to order at 2:08 p.m. and called for approval of the agenda. Agenda approved(Green/Rasmusson).
3. Approval of the Minutes from 10/18/12 (Rasmusson/Wiley); Minutes approved as amended; 2 abstentions.
  - a. Amendments
    - i. Correct spelling of names: Saied and Rasmusson
    - ii. Include Opp/Rasmusson for Math/Computer Science MSP, one abstention.
4. Report of the Chair
  - a. Chair Chamberlain reported on takeaways from attending a conference on accreditation for recreation programs. Brief report on the Planning for Distinction Steering Committee, introducing Senate Chair Watnik to address the nuts and bolts of how the process is going to work. Two task forces are in place: the Instructional Program Task Force (Chaired by Drs. Lopez and Mangold) and the Support Program Task Force (Chaired by Deans Agrawal and Nelson). The Instructional Program Task Force has been developing their process, has a plan and a calendar. The Senate will request a report from the Planning for Distinction Steering Committee and the Task Forces at each Senate meeting. Wiley: Will there be training for academic leaders? Watnik: All meetings will be open, will follow up once he has more information. All questions should go to Lori Erdman, Director of Special Projects in Administration & Finance. She will have a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) button on the Planning for Distinction website.

5. Report of the Presidential Appointee
  - a. Wiley: Question about process of formalizing her role as Sue Opp's representative on CAPR, and naming of the Presidential Appointee. Watnik: Recommended communicating to ExComm about the committee's interpretation of the APGS seat on CAPR, which would not require changing the Bylaws.
6. Information Item
  - a. Progress on Academic Program Review Website: Donnelly reviewed the layout of the Institutional Effectiveness website, which includes Program Portfolios and Academic Program Review. There will be a page for each program, to include all learning and assessment accomplishments. Also create a link with Faculty Development.
7. Old Business
  - a. Review of current committee Policies and Procedures
    - i. Recommended amendments by Chair Chamberlain: Change language of the Preamble to be in alignment with the University document. Withdrew proposed deletion of language regarding facilities and student members on committees. Watnik: There are two student representatives for every standing Senate committee, including CAPR. FAC and COBRA are exempt from student representation. Moved to accept recommended amendments (Green/Chamberlain); passed unanimously.
    - ii. Language regarding APGS representative altered to allow for a designee, and a Presidential Appointee (the AVP of Planning & Institutional Research or designee). Moved to approve language change (Wiley/Green); unanimously passed. Watnik: If CAPR moves to interpret the language to mean APGS or designee from the APGS, it can be sent on to ExComm, and if the Senate approves, that would be sufficient. Then the Presidential Appointee position can be filled by the Planning & IR representative. Edwards: Who is the Student Services representative? Watnik: There have been inquiries, but names have not been sent forward. Green: Proposed changes for including language about learning and assessment in Article II A2? Wiley and Chamberlain: Table that discussion until later.
    - iii. Reformatted version of document reviewed.
    - iv. Consideration of making 5-Year Review submissions electronic only.
  - b. Review of Academic Program Review Procedures policy document.
    - i. Recommended policy amendments by Chair Chamberlain. Move language about Annual Reports up to the front of the document. Include revised language about the Annual Report annual learning outcome assessment cycle (drafted at the 10/18/12 meeting). Machamer: Importance of analyzing and interpreting data presented in the Annual Report. Wait until the Program

Prioritization Process is complete, and consider including recommended outcome data. Taylor: CBE has just gone through a visit from AACSB, and just generating reports wasn't sufficient to satisfy the accreditor's expectations. Chair Chamberlain: Program Prioritization will consider cost vs. value issues. Machamer: Program Prioritization will result in defining criteria that will be considered in prioritizing program, and once the institution has come to conclusions about what is important ("Here's what a really good program looks like"), then CAPR can include requests for IR data that is relevant to those criteria. Taylor: Assessment should be focused on actions where changes can be made. Wiley: Need to consider a reasonable date for submitting reports that would allow for analysis and interpretation. Chair Chamberlain: Monday of the tenth week of the Spring Quarter? Rasmusson: When will CAPR do the work of reviewing annual plans and reports? Guo: Department Chairs are likely to resist a deadline that is in the tenth week of the quarter. Better to have the report due at the end of the Spring Quarter. Chair Chamberlain: No later than the last day of May? Donnelly: recommends changing wording from "gather" to "collect and or compile". Rasmusson: The annual cycle could serve as a framework, rather than be prescriptive about when everything has to be done. Some programs are already involved with doing assessment during other quarters. Edwards: What if a Dean has problems with a program's Five-Year Review? What can they do at that point? Wiley: This was included because of discussions last year acknowledging that Deans should be more actively involved, and should do more than just sign off without doing a close review of the report. Chair Chamberlain: The statement is intended to get more involvement from Deans before the 5-Year Reviews are being presented to CAPR. Taylor: Include wording that acknowledges a response from the Deans. Donnelly: Take out the final words in the last sentence, starting with "of any CAPR recommendations". Chair Chamberlain: Deans will acknowledge that the 5-Year Review has been read, and will respond to the self-study and external review. Chair Chamberlain: Do we still need to require hard copies of all the 5-Year Reviews? Donnelly: If they are going to be submitted electronically, they need to be legible and in good shape so that the report is intelligible. Chair Chamberlain: Recommend submission of PDF. Motavalli: Strike language about including all of the Annual Reports with the 5-Year Reviews. The Annual Reports should all be posted for review. Chair Chamberlain: Strike 'hard copies' and 'submission of annual reports' on May 15th. Chair Chamberlain: In the Timeline for September, include language that says that the CAPR Chair will notify program

chairs of upcoming reviews. Recommends formatting changes to the reporting document that will create a template for the Annual Report. Wong: Will assessment of learning outcomes focus on students who are majors in a program only, or should programs assess learning at the class level where there are also students taking the class who aren't majors? Green: Important question, deserves further discussion. Move to accept proposed changes (Wiley/Taylor): Passed unanimously. Rasmusson: Change language at the beginning of the assessment cycle, to state "where, for example", so that it is less prescriptive. Guo: Question about Section 2.6 language regarding SB 1440.

- c. Review of CAPR duties in the CSUEB University Faculty Constitution and Bylaws.
8. New Business.
- a. Excomm charge from the Senate Chair to form a Self-Support Subcommittee. Chair Chamberlain: Last year CAPR reviewed a number of requests to review proposed new Self-Support programs, and there were concerns about the demands from those programs on Stateside academic resources.
    - i. Appoint 2 CAPR members to join Self-Support Subcommittee: Wiley and Taylor volunteered. Wiley: There are definitely FAC implications, and that committee should be actively involved in these discussions.
  - b. Annual Report review assignments from those received late 2011/12 submissions. Chair Chamberlain will send out assignments, along with rubric for review, and assigned CAPR members will complete the reviews.
9. Other business. Edwards: Should we be sending out communications to the programs that will be up for review this year and next year? Chair Chamberlain: Will be sending out templates for communications with the assignments.
10. Adjournment. Move to adjourn (Green/Edwards): unanimous movement to leave.

Minutes submitted:  
Sharon Green, CAPR Secretary