COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW

Thursday, January 31, 2019

TO: Members of the Committee on Academic Planning & Review (CAPR)

FROM: Michele Korb, Chair of CAPR

SUBJECT: CAPR Meeting, Thursday, February 07, 2019, 2:00 – 4:00 PM., SF 329

DRAFT MINUTES (present: Korb, Fencsik, Yeung, Drew, Eros, Kaatz, Moore, Radcliff, Khosla (zoom), Scharberg (phone)

Guests: D. **LeDuc,** M. **Lee,** M. **Watnik,** C. Inouye**,** S. Montavali, F. Shahbodaghlou, R. Wong

1. Election of the Secretary (Drew)
2. Approval of the agenda (Moore/Fencsik)
3. Approval of 12/6/18 minutes (Fencsik/Kaatz)
4. Reports
   a. Report of the Chair (Korb: Introduction of members & guests.)
   b. Report of the Presidential appointee (Yeung: Feedback from dashboard that is helpful. Looking to revamp and redo next summer. Fairly quiet round of program review. Korb: Yeung has been extremely helpful for program review.)
   c. Report of APS (Scharberg on speakerphone: ILO subcommittee update is working on developing rubrics for sustainability and social justice. On holiday break Dr. Scharberg divided the existing policy into three documents: 1) overview of pieces and significance; 2) annual report document; 3) 5-year annual review – added section on external reviewers that was missing. Is this a direction that CAPR wants to move in? Watnik: Having been a chair, these policies seem intermingled. Separating documents will add clarity about deadlines, content. Discretizing it might make it clearer for departments and academic senate. Scharberg's specific suggestions will be included in next CAPR meeting; review her suggestions in the future for adoption. Korb: Goals are to get deadlines set early for next year. Will probably run this past EEC as well.)
5. CAPR Liaison
   a. Liaison assignment updates: Review CAPR 5 year reviews from 2017-18 – approve and next steps (Korb: Scharberg met with Provost regarding shorter summary and closing the loop. CAPR liaisons have met with departments, made 2-page summaries, and the departments can look at longer documents on CAPR website. Lee: The 5-year reviews used to be contentious and dept

chairs complained they were busy work. Try and link work of programs to outcomes and WASC assessment & tenure track hiring. CAPR was tied in to making a forward-looking case that 5-year reviews helped departments achieving assessment goals and strengthened cases for TT hiring; 5-year review could be brought into negotiations with Deans. CAPR liaison was intended to help departments identify what they do well &, also, to have depts do self-evaluation of what they do well and what they need to achieve. Give them opportunity to compete for resources and goals (TT hires). CAPR liaison as midwife or facilitator. Meeting with the Provost next week to ensure that the 5-year reviews are still linked to department outcomes and are key part of the Provost's decision-making. Hope that the planning comes to fruition. Quality of reports vary across programs. When departments bundle multiple programs into one report, it can become a bit tricky. Want to avoid making reports duplication efforts for the liaison. Work does require some commentary and judgement. Moore: I think external reviewers breaks that ice and provides substantive critique. Lee: Often external reviewers open door for pointing things out; thus, they are important to a 5-year review. Korb: Emphasize shared governance and peer review is important. We need to get clarification about CAPR recommendations that departments continue with / without modification or discontinue. Some programs need to provide more evidence., but do all need to modify in some way? Lee: In conversion process, nearly ever program has been modified. In the past, CAPR had to provide a policy for suspension / discontinuance; is there a box for suspension or discontinue risk, so it doesn't come out of the blue? Watnik: Interdisciplinary studies was discontinued a few years ago. A few senators volunteered to run the program, but they weren't able to revive it. It ultimately was shut down by CAPR a few years ago. Korb: Do recommendations go through senate? Watnik: Yes.)

b. Review all programs and documents (continuation statements)
   i. Computer Science
   ii. Construction Management
c. Annual report summary for Provost – review (Korb: Annual reports in two chunk. Shared Provost document with CAPR in the fall. Wrote a summary to Provost & Scharberg about CAPR assessment trends. Will meet with Provost next week).

6. Business Items:
   a. CAPR Policies and Procedures
      i. Changes and updates – suggestions from APS Director (Korb: We will continue on with following Scharberg)
   b. Memo from ILO re: temporary membership increase (Korb: Radcliff's committee asked for increased membership. ILO subcommittee is approving rubrics for all the ILOs. Their courses are piloting the rubrics. They need more person-power to help them. CAPR needs to approve membership increase. Radcliff: People are on leave and there is a large norming process that requires multiple faculty readers. We can't get as many people to review each paper. Watnik: it is a workload issue. Stein: Busy as ILO subcommittee has ever been & will stay at same pace next year. Right now, ILO subcommittee is doing pilots & standard setting. Almost twice the amount of work. Requested this as temporary increase in membership, as committee needs will fall in the future. Lost some members who were occupied elsewhere. Watnik:

membership needs to be approved by EXCOM. Motion to approve: (Kaatz/Eros). Approved unanimously.

c. Request for adoption of ILO Quantitative Reasoning measurement rubric (Stein: Faculty driven, faculty approved ILOs. Faculty piloted, Part of long term ILO assessment plan. Come from array of colleges. Ended up with 7 criterion. These are core competencies, but not every assignment applies to all the disciplines / assignments / departments. Discussion of variation in documents. Any ILO assignment needs to apply 5 of the criteria. Realized that quantitative reasoning seems more disciplinary than a core competency; CSUEB faculty from each college went through an assessment. They assessed their own assignments using the ILO criteria. The faculty assessor's distribution of scores chart has a distribution as expected. Came to a new place, which is that disciplinary faculty need to assess. Lee: Understanding that this will then go to Senate and President for approval & signature. Motion to approve: (Kaatz/Eros). Approved unanimously.

d. Request for adoption of ILO Oral Communication measurement rubric (Stein: same format as for Quantitative Reasoning. Again, not every aspect of rubric is in every assignment. In this case, presentation aids may not be applicable. Motion to approve: (Eros / Moore). Approved unanimously.

e. New Minor in Religious studies (Katz: worked on this for a few years and it was positive. Watnik: reasonable minor and has been approved by other levels. The departments are using existing classes and students can use to collect into a minor if needed. A hospitality course was considered for inclusion, but ultimately rejected because the religious part was minimal and Hospitality did not want to modify course. Motion to approve: (Kaatz / Eros). Approved unanimously.

7. Discussion Items:

a. Construction Management code change *(time certain - 3 pm):* (S. Montavali and F. Shahbodaghlou) Requesting to change current CIP code, as required by Department of Education to one that is more appropriate. Progam has changed significantly since conversion to semesters and new code would be more appropriate. The program's math and technology requirements and the students' backgrounds are more related to technology than management. Also, trying to unify under accreditation. The change will have no resource implications. Korb: Important to have proper code that describes program appropriately. Yeung: The word 'management' in the program gets flagged each time. Have you considered switching it? Answer: No. it is a standard. Watnik: changing CIP code needs approval by CAPR and the president. The campus needs to make an argument to chancellor's office about the code issue. APS will send it to chancellor's office if president approves. CAPR can provide a comparison of old and new program requirements to strengthen reasoning to change code. Lee: Chancellor's office is target. Fanny: Include specific CIP definitions in reasoning.)

b. **Rose Wong** – discussion of department's plan (with request to CLASS Dean under review) to resume admissions in part-time MSW program in Fall 2020, CAPR requested to maintain status as 'suspended admissions.' (Watnik: CAPR recently passed document separating state side and self-support, part of reasoning was MSW program. APS needs to present to WASC what programs

are inactive. Apparently, MSW self-support program was part time and hasn't been admitting students in past few years. If it was state-side, they would have had to report it to CAPR. It would seem that this committee would discuss the status of what the program is. If program is not admitting for next year, perhaps CAPR should think of it as suspended for next year. May resume Fall 2020. Wong: Accredited in 2006, 2010, and June 2019. Graduated last year of 3-year cohort in June 2018. Situation is this: decided in conjunction with college to suspend. We should like to reopen the program. High demand of potential students, plenty of local jobs. Created a strategic plan to give better support, coordination, and better faculty support program. With the counselor and social work education --- if it is just suspended admissions, notify and 30 days later up on track. With formal suspension, long self-study required. Requested to resume admissions and have students again in Fall 2020. If program is suspended, what is CAPR side or WASC side? Lee: look back in detail at suspension policy. Korb: I don't see any reason to not continue on and see what site visitor says. As far as WASC, I don't know. I think we can just say we've resumed it, but I don't know. Korb: See if we can keep on timeline as far as admitting students. Wong: Unsure how long it will take Provost, President, Dean to make their decisions. Curious about whether CAPR will have a role? Lee: If it hasn't been suspended, policy doesn't apply. Watnik: APS was not informed about discontinuation in program. Korb: In future, programs should notify APS about suspending admissions. Watnik: University has responsibility to current students to be able to finish program.17-18 CAPR 4. Social work could come to CAPR, tell you about assumed changes. Lee: CAPR could take control of process and apply CAPR procedures. The chair of this committee needs to decide, based on the reaction of the committee. If it is found to be an actual suspension, we need to adhere to policies of senate. Katz: Does the president think it is suspended? If not, can we reinstate this normally? Wong: We were suspending admissions temporarily, not closing the program. Lee: reviews suspension procedures; program is not suspended in view of academic senate. Katz: 5-year review process would take many years. Watnik: MA in Soc, there was no ramping down. There was a lack of resources, so they were suspended. WASC said it was 3 years, and they needed to resume or stop. Because of resources, needed to close it. APS is concerned with the quality of academic programs. No one told anyone about the lack of admissions, so faulty info was given to Chancellor's office and WASC. The reason CLASS Dean didn't report was because they believed that they still had an MSW plan and it's active. Korb: We have a program that has fallen into the cracks. Suggests that MSW creates a narrative about what has happened and what will happen.

8. Adjournment (Kaatz & Eros)