

California State University, East Bay
Committee on Academic Planning & Review
Amended Meeting Minutes
Thursday, February 7, 2013

Members Present: Chris Chamberlain (Chair), John Eros (Secretary), Dana Edwards, Sharon Green, Caron Inouye, Amber Machamer, Saeid Motavalli, Xeno Rasmusson, Glen Taylor, Donna Wiley

Members Absent: Julie Beck, Gary Manalang, Sue Opp,

Guests: Toni Fogarty, Jiansheng Guo (CLASS Associate Dean), Sophie Rollins, Kim Geron, Linda Ivey, Nancy Thompson, Mitch Watnik

Minutes

1. Introductions
2. Approval of the agenda (Green/Motavalli)
3. Approval of the minutes of [1/17/13](#) (Inouye/Green)
4. Report of the Chair
 - a. Reminder of [Annual Report](#) and [5-year Review](#) schedules
 1. **Review of Annual reports:** Wiley: why is Marriage and Family submitted separately from Counseling? Chamberlain will check. Chamberlain: will wait one meeting in order to look over the annual reports. Some departments have submitted annual reports with five-year reviews. Chamberlain: if they do their annual, do they have to do their five-year as well? Chamberlain will check. Green: are we to also invite the program representative? Chamberlain: No. People have come, but for other reasons. We are starting to send the reports that we write back to the departments.
 2. **5-Year Reviews:** Chamberlain reviewed the schedule for five year reviews. Music will need to update CAPR when accreditation is completed. Chamberlain reviewed the review process, including before and after the presentation at CAPR. Green suggested March 7 for Health Science. Motavalli suggested March 7 for Theater. Chamberlain: notify the programs of the day, and let them know that a member of FDEC will be sitting in. The document is sent to Kim Geron. Green noted that a response had not been gotten from English and asked who follows up in these cases. It is Guo.
 3. Green: shouldn't nursing go on the same day as Health Sciences? Chamberlain: Let's decide if they can go on the same day. If you nail down a

day, notify the program, then see if they need a certain time, then let them know that a member of the DELO committee will be sitting in. Green: I am not getting a response from English. Who follows up in these cases? [note: it is Guo] Chamberlain: check the office to see what we have already, then check with the deans. Wiley: about the CAPR website: no hotlink means no document? Rollins: it's more for records.

4. Item for the senate that will come up next meeting: Proposal related to Planning for Distinction: a resolution that says that the criteria for ranking programs to the process would be submitted to the senate via CAPR, so we would have a direct workload link for "reviewing all of the Planning for Distinction stuff." Chamberlain: surprised that this is not part of our workload. This resolution would have our criteria used as *the* criteria, and we would be part of the review process, which we are not currently. Green: not clear why CAPR would be brought in for another overview. Why would we do it unless it's to have more faculty involved? If we are to do this, there should be release time; Edwards: two of CAPR are on the Instructional Committee; is concerned about workload, but the request seems relevant to faculty governance concerns; Motavalli: agrees that it changes workload for us; Wiley: they are getting release time already. Chamberlain: it implies that it would be a full review through CAPR. Wiley: or is it just our criteria? Does not see the added value. Consensus seemed to be that it is not necessary and would add significantly to CAPR's workload.

5. Report of the Presidential appointee (Machamer): This year's data is not available until half way through the year, but perhaps we could *prioritize data for programs going through the prioritization process; Those programs going through program review get priority, beginning in the fall.* Chamberlain: a number of programs are frustrated and just don't know where to go. Perhaps make a video or some sort of tutorial. Green: This might be discussed in Council of Chairs, through Ivey Dobb?

6. Report of APGS (Wiley): The self-support task force is charged with looking at the various issues that have been raised. Looking for ways to contact programs early

7. Report of the ILO subcommittee: Chamberlain: there was a request for a joint statement from the Provost and the senate regarding the assessment process on campus. The request was to request of the senate a joint statement as to why this is that important. We are the assessment police – should we make a request. Wiley: WASC-related: what are the various roles of these committees working on the same issues?

8. New Business:

- a. New self-support certificate request: [Health Informatics Graduate Certificate](#) in the Department of Public Affairs and Administration (attached courses are information only) (*Fogarty and Guo*)
 - a. Fogarty: this is a growing field; Kaiser has contacted us with a letter of

support. Hope that it will lead to scholarships. Reason created is: looking at other certificates and organizations. Mavis: what is the format? Fogarty: self-support on-line, interest in hybrid format as well. Green: Acknowledges the assessment plan and tie-in to ILOs. Inouye: faculty resources? Fogarty: 3 lecturers with experience, as well as former students who are encouraging the certificate. There won't be a lack of qualified faculty. Inouye: FT faculty used? Fogarty: involved in search for two people. Mavis: estimated enrollment? Fogarty: one cohort of 30 students. Mavis: SW has a huge self-support program. **Move to approve (Wiley/Rasmussen): approved unanimously**

- b. Request for [discontinuance of the Management of Human Resources and Change MPA option](#) (Fogarty and Guo)
- a. Fogarty: problem is low enrollment. Currently there are fewer than 5 students. We are advising students away from it. Deans have been notified. Rasmussen: Is there anything else that can be done to raise enrollment? Fogarty: described what has been done (various programs) and they are not working. **Motion: (Rasmussen/Edwards): passes unanimously**
- c. History Five-year Review report (*Chris Chamberlain*); Presented by Linda Ivey and Nancy Thompson: Assessments are fine; there is a need for more TT faculty. 150 undergrad/30-50 grad majors. For assessment, students choose a geographical area of focus, as well as breadth courses, as well as basic courses and a tiered system of core courses for the major, 1-2 senior capstones (research). The numbers over the five-year review show improvement. Chamberlain: where do the majors go? Thompson: graduate school, publishing, foreign service, museums. Chamberlain: Is it a growth industry? Ivey: yes. Typically, grad students want to be teachers or want to go into public history. Chamberlain: does it work with multimedia or the arts? Ivey: Yes. Working with Diana Wakimoto in library regarding digital media. Chamberlain: what are your needs? What can you improve upon in the next period? Ivey: We need TT to build this out. We have curricular gaps. Chamberlain: How are they filled now? Ivey: lecturers and TT doing independent studies. Chamberlain: how many do you need? Ivey: We currently have 9 FT faculty; we have applied for 5 before and are now trying for 1 at a time. Chamberlain: what can you improve on? Ivey: Developing clear options as clear tracks. Just introduced a new course on the teaching of history (seniors and graduate students). Thompson: Using more grad students as readers, to get practical experience. Green: I acknowledge your good work. What concerns do you have for retention and graduation, as well as anything about diversity? Ivey: Advising has been spotty. We're trying to let students know that any TT faculty can be their advisor. There are times when they are getting ready to graduate and have not gotten the right advice. Thompson: I believe there has been improvement. Wanda helps facilitate this. Green: Are students moving through in a reasonable amount of time? Thompson: it is a flexible program. Ivey: they connect as soon as possible. Green: what are your observations on diversity?

Thompson: more Hispanics, fewer African Americans, I think the department is welcoming. Green: Do you have outreach? Thompson: Yes, church events, transfer days, freshmen orientation days. And graduate events. Machamer: do you have a writing course? Thompson: Yes, we are proud of this, I see marked difference. Ivey: there is strong component of developing writing. Machamer: it is important to pass our writing test, this is way for your program to grow. Chamberlain: Is there a checklist that your students get? Ivey: yes. Machamer: Do you get enough support with technology? Would you need help from PEMSA? Ivey: Wanda Washington updates transcripts. But it would be easier to have access to transcripts. Geron: One of our committee's charges is to work with CAPR regarding diversity. Issues that we address, such as student diversity, faculty diversity – is it comparable to our students?, etc. Motavalli: enrollment? Ivey: We are staying steady. **Motion to accept report: (Green/Rasmusson)**

- d. CAPR procedures for approving new programs. Wiley: This came out of the self-support task force. Any new program has to go thru CAPR and Senate. But self-support doesn't go through Senate, which seems to be a gap. Should it say that every program that goes through self-support has to go through CAPR? Could this be sent out? It won't go to Senate until CAPR approves. Chamberlain will send this out for us to review and vote on next time.

9. Other business:

- a. Discussion of the Five-year Review summary process. Inouye: Is there a way to streamline it? Chamberlain: ideally, program executive summary should really write our report for us. Let's examine if this rubric is working for us. Inouye: matrix is good, but why do we have to reverbalize from the report? Wiley: a happy medium, just the main points. Chamberlain: would it be helpful to look at the matrix and where it can be cut? Wiley: no. Inouye: look at the response section – how do we really need to respond? Chamberlain: Something that needs to be understood but not immortalized.
- b. Discussion of Annual Report online submission. Chamberlain: met with Tom Suhu in CEAS; Discussed having an online type-in annual report. Tom said: we could use the cascade server that we use for our profiles It is possible to go into our system and make changes to our bios. There is a pdf and a video for how to change your video. Chamberlain: if there is interest in doing this, then I will set up a test. Sharepoint can also be used. Inouye: what about survey-style, like Survey Monkey? Chamberlain: would like to have something to try and roll out by May. Green: and this could be extended to the 5-year review, including our writing our reports. Machamer: who would manage it? Is there something that IT already has?
- c. Discussion of a request to Academic Senate to craft a joint statement with the Provost on Assessment. Chamberlain: there should be something about the campus's commitment to assessment. Rassmussen: There is a lot of confusion among the faculty. A statement is needed. Wiley: Would this go through the Senate? Chamberlain: This request came from the ILO

subcommittee. There has been a request for clarification of why this is done. Edwards: The primary reason is WASC. Watnik: there is a conflict in views of the motivation for assessment between faculty and administration. There have been hints that there should be a meeting. Chamberlain: we will table this for later.

11. Adjournment 4:07

Minutes Submitted:
John Eros CAPR secretary

CAPR web page:

<http://www20.csueastbay.edu/faculty/senate/committees/capr/index-capr.html>