California State University, East Bay
Committee on Academic Planning & Review
APPROVED Meeting Minutes
Thursday, November 15, 2012

Attending: Chris Chamberlain (Chair), Sharon Green (Secretary), Dana Edwards, John Eros, Caron Inouye, Saeid Motavalli, Sue Opp, Xeno Rasmusson, Donna Wiley, Andrew Wong

Members Absent: Glen Taylor

Guests in Attendance: Tamra Donnelly (Academic Programs and Accreditation Specialist), Jiansheng Guo (Associate Dean, CLASS), Amber Machamer (Associate VP, Planning & Institutional Research), Nancy Mangold (Chair, Accounting), Sophie Rollins (Academic Senate), Kaameelah Wesley (Academic Senate).

1. Introductions

2. Chair Chamberlain called meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. and called for approval of the agenda. Approval of the Agenda (Motavalli/Edwards).
    a. Amendment: Add report from the ILO Subcommittee at Item 7.

3. Approval of the Minutes from 11/01/12 (Wiley/Motavalli); passed unanimously as amended.
    a. Amendments
        i.   Julie Beck is not technically absent from this quarter's meetings.
        ii. Mitch Watnik was a guest, but was also included as absent.
        iii. Correction of spelling of COBRA.

4. Report of the Chair
    a. Chair Chamberlain reported on work in MOU meetings. Reported on Planning for Distinction process presented to Academic Senate this week. Suggested that CAPR is a good forum for discussion of that process going forward.

5. Report of the Presidential Appointee.
    a. No report.

6. Report of APGS. AVP
    a. AVP Opp: Important for programs to be questioned about assessment when they come before CAPR: what assessment has been completed, what actions have been taken as a result of assessment evidence, what are programs already doing that counts as assessment, and what changes have programs made to improve their programs. Chair Chamberlain: It will be helpful to

set up meetings with department chairs to talk about assessment expectations and provide guidelines for how to meet the expectations. AVP Opp: Could programs also agree to make available the results of their assessment efforts (Engineering as an example) so that other programs across campus can see what is being done. Motavalli: Agreed.

7. Report of ILO Subcommittee. Green: Just received word from Sally Murphy, Senior Director of Undergraduate Studies and General Education, that she was unsuccessful in finding a candidate to represent GE on the ILO Subcommittee. Would like CAPR to approve the list of candidates for the ILO Subcommittee, with the yet-to-be-filled GE representative and students, and forward the list for approval by ExComm. Moved (Opp/Rasmusson); unanimously passed. List of proposed ILO Subcommittee Members:
    a. CBE: Sharon Green and Gregory Theyel
    b. CEAS: Chris Chamberlain and Denise Fleming
    c. CLASS: Michael Lee and Sarah Nielsen
    d. CoS: Caron Inouye and Julia Olkin
    e. Library: Aline Soules
    f. GE Representative: TBD
    g. Co-Curricular: John Whitman, SCAA
    h. 2 Student Representatives: TBD

8. Old Business
    a. CAPR Policies and Procedures with interpretation. Chair Chamberlain: Now is the time to make permanent changes to some of the language in the document.
        i. Proposed permanent changes: AVP of Academic Programs and Graduate Studies "or designee" added to Item C4. AVP Opp: Should the language be one regular member or faculty of the Library? Rasmusson: We need to be consistent with the language of the Senate Constitution and By-Laws. Rollins: The Constitution and Bylaws state "representative of the Library". Guo: What does Item 7 mean? Rollins: It's not in the By-Laws any more and can be removed. Edwards: What is the role of students on CAPR? AVP Opp: Might consider making them liaisons rather than voting members. Move to approve change in language for C 4 and strike 7 (Rasmusson/Motavalli): unanimously approved.
    b. Discussion of changing language in Article II, Section A 2 regarding inclusion of assessment language in APR document (tabled at 11/1/12 meeting). Wiley: Propose a qualifying phrase following "program" to state "including evaluation of student learning and assessment". Edwards: It doesn't seem to belong here because assessment is one of a number of criteria that are used to evaluate

programs, but it is the only criterion that is being specifically listed. Rasmusson: Assessment is not new in program review, and although it is receiving more emphasis now, it doesn't deserve to receive special attention. Green: Initially recommended this to formalize that CAPR is the faculty governance "home" for learning and assessment, including oversight for the ILO Subcommittee. Rasmusson: Perhaps the document needs another item that is focused on this issue. AVP Opp: There is nothing about Annual Reports or about considering Self-Support programs included either. Chair Chamberlain: There could possibly be bullet points under 2 that describe what is included under evaluation, including 5-Year Review, Annual Review, and review of Self-Support Proposals. Guo: Assessment is addressed in the 5-Year Review Policy document. Shouldn't that be sufficient? Chair Chamberlain: The policy document is intended to be broad, and the procedures document provides the more specific requirements. AVP Opp: 5-Year Reviews are required by the Chancellor's Office. Inouye: CAPR is responsible for evaluating the programs' 5-Year Reviews, not for reviewing the programs themselves. AVP Opp: Could include in Item 4, "including Self-Support Programs". Guo: Would like to include reference to "Academic" programs. Edwards: Are Self-Support programs required to go through 5-Year Reviews? Green: Recommendation that this concern be forwarded to the ExComm Special Task Force for discussion. AVP Opp: If there isn't a curricular change, Self-Support program proposals don't go to CIC. This needs to be considered by CAPR because there currently isn't a place to go for approval of a new program. Rasmusson: Items 5 & 8 are duplicates. Wouldn't one of these items be relevant for reviewing Self-Support programs? Chair Chamberlain: Strike 5, renumber appropriately, correct "with" in 7. Edwards: Leaning toward including language that makes clear that CAPR is not reviewing the Self-Support programs themselves, but is responsible for reviewing proposals. Chair Chamberlain: Revise 4 to include acknowledgement of Self-Support Programs. Guo: No Academic Senate requirement to approve new Self-Support programs, Chancellor's Office requires approvals. AVP Opp: When there is a request to move a program to Self-Support, if it doesn't include a change in curriculum, it only goes to the Chancellor's Office for approval. The proposal leaves the Senate Office without others knowing about the change. When going to on-line AND Self-Support, then we should consider whether it should go through CIC AND CAPR. Rasmusson: Should we add something about Annual Reports to the document? Chair Chamberlain: Add to 2, "to evaluate each existing Academic Program annually, and at intervals not to exceed five years". Guo: Use the language "to review the Annual Reports from each program". We're not

reviewing the reports; we're reviewing the programs. Chair Chamberlain: Disagree.   Machamer: We're validating the review process, not reviewing the program. Move to approve the language "To review each existing academic programs' annual and 5-Year Review" (Rasmusson/ Motavalli): passed unanimously.

c. Annual Report Reviews:
    i. Educational Leadership: Motavalli reported. Program is new, so assessment cycle just started recently, not much done so far. Did assess SLOs, and have made changes based on assessment process.
    ii. Teacher Ed: Motavalli reported. Assessment has been completed, progress was reported. No changes made to program on the basis of assessment.
    iii. Special Ed: Wong reported. How dp items 1a and 1b differ? Rasmusson: Difference refers to process. Wong: What is missing is a list of goals and objectives, and they make no reference to a student learning outcomes assessment plan.
    iv. Move to approve all Annual Report Reviews (Wiley/Opp): passed unanimously.

d. Recommended links regarding assessment and program review. Looked at link to SLO Assessment Planning Dialogue Summary as example of an on-line reporting form.

9. New Business
    a. Discussion of Self-Support Program issues. Chair Chamberlain reviewed history and status of CAPR involvement with Self-Support programs, including reference to the large number of proposals that came before CAPR last year. Wiley: She will be representing CAPR on the Self-Support Program Task Force, and would like to hear from CAPR members about their CAPR-related concerns. Chair Chamberlain: Need to consider revenue implications. Edwards: Also consider contract issues and compensation of faculty in self-support programs. Wiley: Prefer to focus on issues that are in CAPR's purview. For example, resources being utilized in Biology for the Pre-Professional Health Sciences (PPHS) Certificate program. Inouye: The program is also using Biology course prefixes, but Biology isn't consulted. The PPHS Certificate program delivers the entire Biology curriculum on self-support. It utilizes staff resources and lab space. Chair Chamberlain: This then becomes a quality control issue. Wiley: It also represents a lack of transparency relevant to what's going on in the Self-Support programs. Edwards: If CAPR is responsible for reviewing the plans for these programs, all of these issues should be considered, and CAPR needs to be informed. Green: These issues need to be clarified in the CAPR Policies and Procedures. Guo: Also need to consider whether the Self-Support programs

should be reviewed. AVP Opp: Look at the flowchart in the Curricular Procedures manual. CAPR is not represented on this flow chart. There is no clear place indicated for CAPR's involvement. Edwards: These programs should go before the Senate.

b. Department of Accounting and Finance. Request to add Master of Science in Accountancy Program to the CSUEB Academic Plan. Chair Mangold reviewed the need for the program (new licensing requirements, expanding labor market demands for licensed accountants, recent challenges to the profession by scandals demanding updated knowledge). When the MBA program was revised, the accounting option was reduced to three courses and doesn't currently support requirements for sitting for the licensing exam. The proposed program is designed to meet the licensing requirements for class time. These are lots of students ready to sign up for the program. Both SFSU and San Jose State offer MSA programs. Sac State offers this program as self-support as well. There are currently no programs in the East Bay to help students prepare for their career. The plan is to start the program in the fall, giving students the option to prepare for the program in the preceding summer. Chair Chamberlain: In-person program (not on-line? Using existing courses or new courses? Chair Mangold: It is an in-person program. Some new courses will be required, and Accounting has put forward the new course requests needed. Inouye: Why not offer this program state-side? Chair Mangold: In 2009, the proposed program went through all committee reviews and was ready to go to Chancellor's Office for approval. However, at that time Dean Swartz decided to make it Self-Support. All new programs in CBE have to be AACSB Accredited, and faculty members teaching classes have to be Academically Qualified. If the program is Self-Support, faculty members have the option of teaching on or off load. AVP Opp: The proposal is being presented as a new Pilot Program. This allows for the program to be implemented and offered for up to five years without going through Chancellor's Office review. The program will need to go through rigorous external review before it can be shifted from a Pilot Program to a permanent program. Rasmusson: To clarify, within five years the program will need to be reviewed before it is made permanent. AVP Opp: The Pilot Program option is new for us. It can only be allowed under limited circumstances. Edwards: This raises concern of creating new programs during a year when Program Prioritization is being considered. AVP Opp: As a member of the Instructional Team, would like to say that this is a good point. Recommends that this program be included in the process along with existing programs. This means that the program could be shut down before it starts if Program

Prioritization decides that it should not go forward. Moved to approve the MS in Accountancy Program to the CSUEB Academic Plan (Wiley/Motavalli): 1 no vote, 1 abstention. Motion is carried.

10. Adjourned. Move to adjourn at 3:59 (Wiley/ Chamberlain).

Minutes submitted:
Sharon Green, CAPR Secretary