

CAPR AMENDED Minutes, 12-05-2013

Members Absent: Farzad Shahbodaghlou, Claudia Sandoval (student representative)

Attending: Chris Chamberlain (Chair), Ken Curr, John Eros, Amber Machamer, Saeid Motavalli, Xeno Rasmusson, Jiannan Wang, Donna Wiley, Eric Fricke, Monique Manopoulos, Sylvia Head

Guests in Attendance: Endre Branstad, Jiansheng Guo, Associate Dean CLASS, Nidhi Mahendra, Mitch Watnik

1. Agenda approved, Fricke/ Motavalli /passed.
2. Approved minutes of 11/7/13; Eros/Fricke/Passed and 11/21/13 Head/Monopolous/passed
3. Report of the Chair: Reported that a faculty grievance has been filed against the President on the basis that faculty are not as involved in the Planning for Distinction process as he had promised. This grievance was upheld by Academic Senate and it was resolved that all documents related to instructional review, including PFD documents, shall be reviewed by CAPR. President has 21 days to appeal the grievance.
4. Report of the Presidential appointee, Amber Machamer announced that she will present a demonstration of the data dashboard for program review at the next meeting.
5. Report of APGS; Sue Opp will present her report under Old Business, 7a, WASC.
6. No ILO report
7. Old business
 - a. Current WASC year; Sue Opp provided an overview. Our WASC Self-Study is due Spring, 2014. WASC will do their campus visit in April, 2015. This is a very important task for the university community and program review is central for the accreditation process. WASC has four standards. Each has CFRs, or Criteria for Review presented in detail in the Handbook. We spent some time discussing the CFRs for Standard 2, Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions. This standard is most closely related to the activities of CAPR and has three sub-areas; Teaching and Learning, Scholarship and Creative Activity, Student Learning and Success. In particular, CFRs 2.2 on graduate programs, 2.3 & 2.4 on clearly identified SLOs and how they are developed and CFR 2.7 which states that all programs are subject to systematic review.
 - b. WASC Criteria for Review (CFR). Reviewed and discussed as part of 7a above.
 - i. Handbook of Accreditation - 2013

- ii. WASC Accreditation 2002-2007
- c. Referral on Planning for Distinction
 - i. Draft Policy statement – CAPR will reconsider this referral after more info in available regarding the faculty grievance upheld by AS as described in the CAPR Chair’s report above.
- d. 12-13 CAPR 5: Program Report template
 - i. Draft revisions – review for next meeting
- e. Annual Report Rubric
 - i. Annual Program Report Instructions – review to finalize at next meeting

8. New Business

a. Communicative Sciences and Disorders 5 year review presentation by Nidhi Mahendra. Overview of self-study emphasizing accreditation process/status, institutional data on enrollment and current faculty members. CSD has earned an 8 year accreditation from ASHA which will take them through 2020. Department has had recent retirements/separations leaving quite a young faculty. Faculty are active in scholarship as well as in seeking and obtaining both external and internal grant support. The department is unique with respect to having an on-campus clinical setting with a non-faculty Clinic Director. Students gain valuable clinical experience in that setting as well as in community-based screening events making use of the mobile auditory assessment van. CSD department is guided by external standards set by three different bodies, ASHA, CTC and NCATE (CAEP) and a number of student outcomes are formally assessed to fulfill those accreditations. However, the departments’ SLO were not listed clearly in the departments 5 year review documents. Discussion by CAPR generally supported and praised CSD for their work, especially with so few faculty, but encouraged them to make sure the SLOS were fully listed in their next annual report and self-study for 5 year review.

b School of Engineering Request. Saeid Motavalli and Dean Michael Leung presented the case to change the Department of Engineering designation to the “School of Engineering.” Reasoning behind request included the recognition of several features: that most universities (including comparison CSU campuses) use such designation; external support as well as higher quality students are more

likely to be attracted to a school of engineering; at its start in 2001, Department of Engineering had only Civil and Industrial programs, have added several more programs (most recently Computer Engineering) and currently the department of engineering covers very different subject matter; and finally, one standard for accreditation in engineering includes the need to have some central control that cannot be accomplished with the current departmental organization. There will be no new costs nor resources associated with this change which will allow these programs to be more competitive with similar institutions.

Moved/seconded/passed to accept the request to change name to School of Engineering: Rasmusson/ Motavalli/ Y=9, N=1, Abstain=1

c. Dean's response to the Human Development 5 Year Review

d. Referral on Procedures for Proposing Schools, tabled as CAPR will review a comprehensive policy on name change and/or divisional reorganization once created.

9. Meeting adjourned at 3:55 pm