

California State University, East Bay
Committee on Academic Planning & Review
AMENDED Meeting Minutes
Thursday, December 6, 2012

Attending: Chris Chamberlain (Chair), Sharon Green (Secretary), John Eros, Amber Machamer, Gary Manalang, Saeid Motavalli, Sue Opp, Xeno Rasmusson, Glen Taylor, Donna Wiley, Andrew Wong

Members Absent: Dana Edwards, Caron Inouye,

Guests in Attendance: Tamra Donnelly (Academic Programs and Accreditation Specialist), Jiansheng Guo (Associate Dean, CLASS), Michael Lee; Julie Marty-Pearson, Sophie Rollins (Academic Senate), James Zarillo (Associate Dean, CEAS)

1. Introductions
2. Chair Chamberlain called the meeting to order at 2:09 p.m. and called for Approval of the Agenda. Approval of the Agenda (Green/Motavalli); passed unanimously.
3. Approval of the Minutes from 11/15/12 (Wiley/Rasmusson); passed unanimously.
4. Report of the Chair
 - a. Chair Chamberlain reported on two CAPR items that had gone before the Senate. In the matter of naming an APGS 'designee' vs. 'appointee', the term 'appointee' was deemed acceptable. Academic Review Document changes: The response to the proposed changes was generally good, but concerns were voiced about the Annual Report recommendations regarding assessment. The main objections had to do with absence of time and resources to support assessment efforts. The second reading of the document will come in January before CAPR meets again. Motavalli: Who requested the changes to the Annual Report? It's a lot of work. Chamberlain: The intention is to make the process of preparing for assessment and reporting in the 5-Year Review as easy as possible, creating an online reporting document and exploring electronic system for capturing data. The Math and Computer Science 5-Year Review Response—Continue with Modification—was challenged in the Senate. Math & Computer Science said that they didn't have the resources to conduct assessment. Wiley: It isn't the "culture" of this University to recommend Continue with Modification. Lee: Because this response was unprecedented, there was concern that this implied a requirement for retroactive assessment. CAPR is moving toward

requiring changes in how programs present the program reviews, but recommends that CAPR consider changing the language for the Math & Computer Science Dept. response because it doesn't represent past practice. Opp: This response is not new. Geology was put on notice and was monitored, and the monitoring was removed when requirements were met. CAPR needs to stand up for what is required, and needs to be willing to insist that programs meet the requirements of Program Review. Lee: CAPR could have refused to accept the 5-Year Report without assessment. Opp: There are four things that CAPR can say in response to a 5-Year Report. Perhaps it should say, "Continue with monitoring". Lee: We should look at what the language is implying. Requiring retroactive or extra assessment will inevitably get that kind of response from the Senate. Rasmusson: Understood that CAPR was requesting that, moving forward, Math & Computer Science do assessment as expected of all programs. Wiley: Recommend changing the language to "Continue with Monitoring". Opp: CAPR developed the option of 'Continue with Monitoring' to soften the language when changes are required. Rasmusson: Remove the language that says "Before CAPR will approve continuation without modification" and put "Specifically, the program...". Motavalli: This isn't a modification of the program, it's only a requirement to do assessment. Wiley: A program isn't just the courses. It also includes assessment of the program. Opp: This is a review that includes multiple programs. Wiley: Change the pronoun that says "it" to "they" in referring to programs and the requirement to assess. Opp: Each program needs to submit assessment evidence. Motavalli: This makes it difficult for Math & Computer Science. It means having to do five reports. Lee: CAPR either continues, modifies, or discontinues programs. This committee can ask for assessment from each of the programs. Carefully word the document so that it is clear what is expected in terms of the amount of work that will have to be done moving forward. Suggest that wording be changed to: "...recommend continuation with the specified modification that the programs submit evidence of direct and indirect assessment. The programs are continuing with the understanding that assessment must be done." Green: CAPR should seriously consider the implications for future program review of modifying the language and saying that changes don't have to be made. Rasmusson: Should CAPR try to ensure there is direction and support for getting PLOs in place and getting assessment going? Opp: The Provost has made it clear that assessment must be done, that we have to maintain accreditation. Lee: Keep up the progress that has been made, and know that there will be resistance. Motavalli: Recommends sending out communication to chairs

making it clear what is expected in terms of assessment. Wiley: Consider changing language in the Program Review document to “using assessment results to make program improvements” in place of “closing the loop”. Guo: Long term, CAPR should interpret what “With Modifications” includes, because it changes with each version of the committee. We’re making progress with acceptance of assessment; now people are saying that they don’t have resources, not that assessment shouldn’t be done. We need to continue to work on getting faculty buy-in. Wiley: Make this a formal action, and send it back to the Senate. Chair Chamberlain: The recommendation is to Continue with Modification with language that requires that assessment be done. Moved: Send the document back to Senate with the language changed to Continue with Modification, with requirement that assessment be completed in the future by the programs in Math & Computer Science (Motavalli/Rasmusson): unanimously approved.

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

6. Report of APGS.
 - a. AVP Opp: Reported on the first meeting of the Educational Effectiveness Council that will support preparation for WASC reaccreditation. The purpose of the Educational Effectiveness Council is to encourage communication among the Colleges and future assessment efforts.

7. Report of ILO Subcommittee. Green: The membership of the ILO Subcommittee was sent forward to ExComm, although the membership may be changing as a few nominated members may not be able to serve. There was a delay in getting the Subcommittee started because a GE representative had not been identified. Attempts are under way to schedule a first meeting before the end of the Fall Quarter.
 - 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. Cal State Chico Academic Program Review Page. Chair Chamberlain: Look at the College of Education for examples of what could be done. This is an opportunity for us to set up an

online program review presence that moves us in the right direction. Donnelly: Reviewed what has been done so far for the CSUEB site, providing the example of the Criminal Justice Department. APGS/Donnelly will be populating the sites. Chair Chamberlain: Would results presented in Annual Reports be appropriate to put up here? Wiley: These could be linked to the Senate page. Donnelly: That could be done. Could also put a department link on the page as well. Rasmusson: Will let department chair know what is being done. Donnelly: Chico program review sections are based on WASC Criteria for Review. Chair Chamberlain: Need to make it as easy as possible for the programs to access and include data in their reports.

9. New Business

- a. Extension for Chemistry and Biochemistry Five-Year Review and Self-Study request. Chair Chamberlain: Received a request to extend the deadline because external reviewer was not available. The program is making progress in developing their 5-Year Review, but is requesting a minor procedural delay. Move: (Green/Motavalli): passed unanimously.
- b. Request for approval of new self-support certificate, authorization to support the requirements of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to meet standards. Associate Dean James Zarrillo and Dr. Linda Smetana reported on the Special Education credential in Early Childhood Special Education. Zarrillo described the new credential program requirements that will serve special education needs for pre-K. Chair Chamberlain: Why is this being offered through DCIE? Zarrillo: CEAS is not sure what the demand will be, and is uncertain about whether there will be resources to offer the program any other way. Chair Chamberlain: Will you be using existing faculty to teach these courses? Smetana: We will probably be bringing in specialists in Early Childhood Development. We will also be exploring the use of hybrid presentation in order to extend the service area, with an on-campus component. Motavalli: Are all of the courses new? Zarrillo: They are all new. Chair Chamberlain: Will these courses be available to all students, or only students signed up through DCIE? Zarrillo: Only for students to take through DCIE, but state-side students could concurrently enroll. Smetana: There has been some interest among current students to take the classes. Rasmusson: Will this compete with the state-side program? Smetana: There will be no competition with the state-side program. Zarrillo: The state-side offerings through CEAS have changed significantly over time. There are many offerings now through DCIE that meet specialized needs, but none of them compete with state-side programs. Taylor: Are any of the DCIE

programs offered on the campus? Is there an issue of presenting this on campus? Opp: It's not a degree program. Wiley: Is a bachelor's degree required? It should be explicitly stated if it is required. Chair Chamberlain: Consider the courses that will be developed. Will these be assessed and will they be reviewed as part of accreditation? Opp: CAPR does not have to approve the courses. They have already been approved by CIC. Move: Approve program with inclusion of requirement for BA noted. (Rasmusson/Taylor). Unanimously approved.

c. Annual Reports

- i. Anthropology: Chair Chamberlain: Report was difficult to read as a narrative, with language that wasn't clear. Assessment wasn't done, with no indication that the program was going to do anything. Response was that there was no money. Wiley: The program is up for 5-Year Review next year, which will be a problem without assessment. Chamberlain: Should these be sent back to the Department? Lee: In the past, they were summarized and sent to the Senate. Recommendation that a memo be sent to the Chair saying that the rubric and review be posted to the Senate website. Wong: What should I say to the department chair? Opp: There are members on the Educational Effectiveness Council who can help with the assessment recommendation. Move to accept (Rasmusson/Taylor): passed unanimously.
- ii. Communication: Chair Chamberlain: Work being done, drafting learning outcomes, drafting rubrics, new staff hired would be doing some of the work. Solid report, with lots going on. Rasmusson: One box not checked. Chair Chamberlain: That should be a 'yes', and it will be changed and resubmitted. Move to accept (Green/Wiley): passed unanimously.
- iii. Education, Option in Reading: Inouye not available. Review presented by Associate Dean Zarillo. No program assessment data because TED did not have students. There are different levels of authorization for specialists. CTC changed the standards for credentials, which changed the need for the program. There will be data for the next annual report. Move to accept the Annual Report (Motavalli/Eros): passed unanimously.

10. Other Business: Chair Chamberlain: Would like to start scheduling 5-Year Reviews soon after the first of the year. CAPR members need to read the 5-Year Reviews and get the program representatives in to the committee. Hope to have History before the committee in January. Chair Chamberlain will be talking with all of the Chairs. Would like to hear

from each member of CAPR about when they will be ready to go. Will send the rubrics out to everybody to begin the process. Thanks to all members of the committee for their hard work. Special thanks to Andrew Wong for substituting for Beck. The next CAPR meeting will be January 17, 2013.

11. From the Floor: Green recommended selecting a Secretary for next quarter. Eros volunteered for Winter Quarter.
12. Adjourned. Move to adjourn at 3:59 (Wiley/ Green).

Minutes submitted:
Sharon Green, CAPR Secretary