



COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW

Friday, November 30, 2018

TO: Members of the Committee on Academic Planning & Review (CAPR)
FROM: Michele Korb, Chair of CAPR
SUBJECT: CAPR Meeting, Thursday, December 06, 2018, 2:00 – 4:00 PM., SF 329

**APPROVED MINUTES (present: Korb, Fencsik, Kaatz, Eros, Moore Helgren, Yeung,
DeLuc, Glass)**

1. Election of the Secretary (Moore)
2. Approval of the agenda (Eros/Kaatz)
3. Approval of [11/1/18](#) minutes (Moore/Eros)
4. Reports
 - a. Report of the Chair (Korb: upcoming items that may require vote by email: Some reqs for theater/dance curriculum changes which had been delayed, an email will be circulated to CAPR members. Completed annual reports are coming in, Mark will post to CAPR website as they arrive, Korb volunteered to go through them to update assessment spreadsheet. Closing the loop on the annual reports and assessment pieces are TBA: will have conversation about it in spring semester. Scharberg, Stein, Korb, and APS will met next week to discuss updates to timelines, this will need committee approval in the spring).
 - b. Report of the Presidential appointee (Yeung: no major concerns about things missing; school of education needs to provide some additional info that is specific to their programs; haven't heard from other depts. DeLuc: bay advisor question: the number of enrolled students in a program don't always match up with the info in the dashboard. Yeung: geology/geoscience is another department that needs to submit updated information, this was fixed last week, so it should not remain an issue moving forward. Keep letting us know if there continue to be inconsistencies).
 - c. Report of APS (Scharberg on zoom: EEC: on track for goals: completing updating college assessment website, PLOs, SLOs, working on written communication assessment, etc. Everything is coming together for educational effectiveness. We'll need to do a mid-cycle WASC review in 20/21. For ILO subcommittee: will submit request to increase membership by two members for one academic year to handle increased workload. Currently reviewing assessment communication/information literacy, will make recs to both EEC and CAPR in spring).
5. CAPR Liaison
 - a. [Liaison assignment](#) reminder – re-read your 5 year reviews from 2017-18 (see spreadsheet on Google Drive) to prepare for summaries – discussion with

program representatives today (see updated summary created on November 9)(Discussion item “7a” below) (Korb will send out reminder re: reaching out to assigned programs for review this spring. May 15, 2019 is the due date for 5 year reviews, liaisons are listed on spreadsheet. Offer to answer questions regarding writing the reports. There are some inconsistencies in the guidelines for review reports, Korb will be working to fix/highlight discrepancies. Must also invite external evaluators for 5 year reviews, there’s a request form on the CAPR page, please complete these, the sooner the better. Helgren recently served as an external reviewer at Sac State so may be able to provide insight as to the process)

6. Business Items:

a. [CAPR Policies and Procedures](#) (Scharberg/Korb meeting to look at older timelines/changes/etc. to provide context: need help from the committee as the documents are very long and difficult to explain in a short time. Think about need to have a strategy to present to XCOM and then Senate, think about workflow, might be better to have separate documents, think about how changes should be formatted and presented. Korb: what are thoughts of people working on a 5 year plan? DeLuc: for a lot of depts., there are particular logistical issues, e.g., directions refer to a document, but it’s not clear where that document is located, or inconsistencies in which a different version of a document is referenced, problems and complications can arise at each step: focus on having a checklist, timeline, and hyperlinks for where each document can be found. If we can keep policy/website/reports all consistent it will greatly facilitate the process. Kaatz: maybe we can make video clips or documents with screenshots to explain the process to those who haven’t done a review before. Helgren: important for report writers to understand the purpose and audience of the report. Yeung, re: data issues: trying to keep data updated on dashboard hub).

i. Changes and updates – suggestions from APS Director

ii. CAPR updated the [policy on suspension](#) of programs in [17-18 CAPR 4](#). (Scharberg to share details) – voting item (Scharberg briefed committee on contents of the document. Clarification: once approved, this will be integrated into the policies and procedures. Discussed details of the policy regarding which entities have the burden of notifying CAPR/APS. Motion to approve: (Moore/Fencsik). Passed without objection.

7. Discussion Items: (Added item on numbering system for engineering (Eros/Kaatz)

a. [Draft 5-year review summary](#): Korb summarized document for guests. Discussed clarifying/framing the purpose of the 5 year reviews, what they’re used for, etc. Proposing that this document serve as guidance for those drafting reports. Scharberg: spoke with provost about what would be most useful for him and how to streamline the process. DeLuc: how do we address our externally accredited programs; do they submit different documents? Scharberg: open to suggestions from experience of programs to avoid duplicative work, provided that there remains a mechanism to review programs that are not part of a department’s external accreditation review. Proposed amending the document to reference accreditation documents, as appropriate. Glass: need to make sure that the template is accessible and

coherent, and make sure there is a rubric available for external review. Discussed the process for developing/reviewing/approving guidance documents for issuing recommendations. Scharberg: that's within CAPR's purview. DeLuc/Glass: need clarification/standardization of the terms "continue with modification" "continue without modification," etc. What kind of modifications are envisioned? What is the range of possible modifications? How to issue suggestions for improvement, etc. without necessarily requiring them? Korb: under 4.0 a middle ground would be for the liaisons to have conversations with authors of 5-year review to develop a recommendation for modifications. Kaatz: the senate document has definitions of continuing with/without modification. Discussed those definitions. Plan to modify summary document and distribute to liaisons. Korb: by our first meeting of the spring semester we'll have started this process).

- b. [GE Long term assessment](#) XCOM had some feedback, some changes/clarifications were made in response. Highlights of changes were sent as ppt. slides from Karen. [Link to slides?] XCOM requests that this becomes action item from CAPR for Senate) Motion to approve changes from Karen (Korb/Kaatz) Approved unanimously.
 - i. [Comparison](#) of GE Assessment Plans
- c. (3pm time certain) – 5 year review conversation and completion of summary/ preparations for conversations with the Provost
- d. (Added item on CIP codes for school of engineering/construction management: request to change the current code, which does not fall under a stem classification, but rather business. However if it were classified as STEM, international students could extend their practical training beyond one year after graduation. Scharberg: we'd have to discuss with the chancellor's office to determine the process for this. Korb: let's table this pending discussion with Watnik and chancellor's office.

8. Adjournment (Moore/Kaatz).