

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY

Designation Code: 2004-05 CAPR 14

Date submitted: October 7, 2005

TO: Academic Senate

FROM: Committee on Academic Planning & Review (CAPR)

SUBJECT: CAPR Year End Report, 2004-05

ACTION  
REQUESTED: Information item to the Senate

BACKGROUND

INFORMATION: The following End of Year Report for 04-05 has been provided to the Academic Senate as an informational item. It is believed by CAPR that some of the information in this report could be helpful to the WASC Process and should therefore be an official document to the Senate.

**Committee on Academic Planning and Review  
End of Year Report 2004-2005**

The Committee met as required on the first and third Thursday of each month between 2-3:50 p.m. Official meeting dates for the Academic Year 2004-05 were: October 7, October 21, November 4, November 18, December 2, January 20, February 3, February 17, March 3, April 7, May 5, and May 19. The January 6<sup>th</sup> meeting was cancelled and the April 21<sup>st</sup> meeting failed to gain a quorum.

Members for the academic year 2004-05 included: Judy Clarence, Library ; Kim Geron, Political Science; Vish Hegde, Management and Finance; Michelle La Centra, Academic Programs; Sally Murphy, Communication/General Education Office; Julie Norton, Statistics; Janet Patterson, Communicative Sciences and Disorders; Asha Rao, Management and Finance; Linda Smetana, Teacher Education; and Helen Zong, Engineering. During the Spring Quarter we had an active student representative, Jessica Chevalier, a senior from Psychology. During the Winter Quarter, Farnaz Ganjeizadeh, Engineering, served as a replacement for Helen Zong, and Berna Polat, Management and Finance, served as a replacement for Vish Hegde. During Summer of 2005, Farnaz Ganjeizadeh, Engineering, began serving for the College of Science as Helen Zhong had completed her service.

We approved and sent to the Senate through the Executive Committee:

1. New BA Major Program in Physics
2. New MS Degree in Engineering Management
3. Discontinuances of the "Creative Arts Option" and the "Recreation and Community Theatre Option", both in the Theatre Arts Major
4. Discontinuance of Urban Teacher Leadership Option
5. Discontinuance of the Telecommunications MS Degree Option in Systems Engineering
6. Discontinuance of Minor in Taxation
7. Discontinuance of Economics Option Liberal Studies
8. Discontinuances of Options in Liberal Studies as requested with amendments

Received and acted on the following Academic Reviews:

1. Communications from 2003-2004
2. Engineering

We accepted and worked on reports for the following Academic Reviews:

1. French/Spanish
2. Multimedia
3. History
4. Nursing
5. Communicative Speech Disorders
6. Geological Sciences
7. Art
8. International Studies

Granted one year delays for the following programs:

1. Mathematics and Computer Science, BS, MS
2. Theater
3. Music
4. Chemistry (outside review)
5. Geography
6. Environmental Studies
7. Public Administration (outside reviewed)
8. Business Administration (outside reviewed)
9. Telecomm review, request to review with Business Administration next year

Granted short term delays for the following programs and have now received all but outside reviewer report:

1. Statistics
2. Psychology
3. Physics
4. Biological Sciences
5. Environmental Sciences

Considered on the following CAPR policy issues:

1. Delays in Academic Reviews, a policy was developed but not approved by the Executive Committee
2. Tenure-track hiring timeline which did not go forward as a CAPR/COBRA document, but as a BEC from the Executive Committee
3. Combining many documents created and approved by faculty bodies which relate to tenure-track hiring and program review, including the timeline above, into a policy on the relationship between academic program review and tenure-track hiring
4. Program review for Extension Programs and Program Review for General Education, agreeing that both programs should have an Academic Review and scheduling a review for General Education to coincide with the next scheduled CIC review in 2007-09
5. Program review for the Library as suggested by WASC and decided for the time being to include library visits within each program, suggesting the outside reviewers should visit the library and the discipline librarian during the regularly scheduled program review but will consider a separate review at a later time
6. Discussed possible options for outside reviewers such as an extra days stay in the area to complete the review before leaving the campus

Remaining issues:

1. Marine Sciences review, request from Dean Leung to excuse this review
2. Final decision on policy issues, particularly tenure track hiring policy and its relationship to academic review above and combined documents progress

We hope that this is the last review period where academic reviews are not clearly linked to resource allocation issues. A large part of our work this past year was to synthesize the rubrics and guidelines of previous CAPR and faculty units. Indeed our work with the hiring timeline and to combine all Academic Program Review Procedures into a single document was directed toward this goal of building a set of materials that can be more easily evaluated and provide more transparency for programs undergoing program review. In ongoing reviews we are using these results to revise our processes to inform programs and the University about the quality of its programs in such a way that there is a common structure built around the Academic Program Review. It is our desire that these reviews be useful to the future of the program and do not result in work that just goes on the shelf.

Our ability to evaluate the quality of our programs has not always been clear, either for CAPR members or for programs undergoing review. Some of the changes that we and previous CAPR committees have undertaken include clearer procedures for the program to understand and for the committee to process and apply. Other changes make a more deliberate link between academic review and resource implications. Establishing a visible link emphasizes the importance of the academic review and makes the review process more relevant to the programs under review and more vital to the University. As we struggled through several reviews this year, we used what we learned in the review process to more clearly detail our procedures. For example, evaluating Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) can be difficult for those outside the field. We implemented and revised the proposed SLO rubric from the previous year's WASC subcommittee. We asked how well the program could determine and evaluate their expectations for students and how well these expectations align with programmatic and University goals. We also asked how well the program implements new ideas gleaned from the assessment process. We also asked how program currency and effectiveness is maintained; how the evidence is collected and utilized to create improvements in the program; and how outside evidence is available and utilized? There is a range of programs and a range of review procedures that programs undergo, from licensing, accreditation, and credentialing to internal reviews. We need to provide review for the entire spectrum of these programs and our procedures need to reflect the diversity that is present at the University.

We experienced a severe shortage of time to complete our work. Partially this was due to delayed outside reviews and thus delayed Academic Reviews, but also because we are feeling an over burden of work from a combination of special assignments from the Senate, WASC requirements, regular committee work, and overly full classes. As a result, we have carried our work over to complete as nearly as possible our assigned reports over the summer. We are continuing to work on the proposed timeline and Academic Review Documents.

Julia Norton  
CAPR Chair 2004-2005