EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

TO: The Academic Senate
FROM: Academic Senate Chair Mark Karplus
SUBJECT: 2017-2018 Senate and Committee Chair Annual Reports

ACTION REQUESTED:
That the Academic Senate accept the packet of 2017-2018 Annual Reports as submitted by the 2017-2018 Academic Senate Chair and Committee Chairs as information.
The chair would like to acknowledge and thank the members of the Executive Committee, chairs and members of the Senate standing committees and subcommittees, and the Academic Senate for their hard work and dedication to shared governance at Cal State East Bay. Below is a summary of notable documents approved or accepted by the Senate in the 2016-17 academic year, arranged by committee of origin.

Executive Committee
17-18 BEC 6 amended: Resolution Regarding Executive Orders 1100 (revised) and 1110
17-18 BEC 9: Changes to 17-18 FAC 4 amended
17-18 BEC 10: Resolution Regarding Appreciation for the American Association of University Professors’ (AAUP) Support of Shared Governance at the California State University (CSU)
17-18 BEC 11: Formation of time modules task force
17-18 BEC 12: Approval of the Academic Programs Subcommittee

Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR)
17-18 CAPR 2: Department of Nursing and Health Sciences Request to Dissolve the Department of Nursing and Health Sciences and Form a Department of Nursing and a Department of Health Sciences
17-18 CAPR 3: Annual report submissions of 2016-2017 as information to the Provost and the Academic Senate
17-18 CAPR 4: Semester updates for the Temporary Suspension of Academic Programs Policies and Procedures document
17-18 CAPR 5: Proposed changes to the Academic Programs Policies and Procedures document regarding discontinuances
17-18 CAPR 6: Summary of Program Annual Report Findings
17-18 CAPR 7: Proposed Assessment Framework
17-18 CAPR 8: Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO) Long-Term Assessment Plan
17-18 CAPR 12: Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO) Information Literacy Measurement Rubric
17-18 CAPR 14: Request for approval of the self-support Single Subject State of California Teaching Credential Program
17-18 CAPR 15: Request for one-year postponement of Liberal Studies Five-year Review
In addition, several name change requests and discontinuances were approved.

Committee on Instruction and Curriculum (CIC)
17-18 CIC 2: University Graduate thesis due dates on semester schedule
17-18 CIC 3: GE considerations for Engineering
17-18 CIC 4: Incomplete grades in the Semester Catalog
17-18 CIC 5: Curricular Procedures Manual and Curricular Timelines
17-18 CIC 6: California Promise Implementation
17-18 CIC 7: Foundational Level General Science Certificate
17-18 CIC 8: Department of Theatre and Dance’s Minor in Inclusive and Social Justice Performance
17-18 CIC 13: Grade Forgiveness for Quarter Courses with No Semester Equivalents
17-18 CIC 14: Change the title of all courses numbered 398, 498, and 698
17-18 CIC 17: 2018-19 General Education Catalog Rights for 2017-18 students
17-18 CIC 18: Revision of Reserved Course Numbers Policy
17-18 CIC 19: Reopening Interdepartmental Consultation on Semester Catalog Courses
17-18 CIC 20: Policy on New Prefixes
17-18 CIC 26: Request for New Undergraduate Concentrations in the BS Hospitality and Tourism
17-18 CIC 28: Registration Order
17-18 CIC 29: HON prefix for University Honors Program
17-18 CIC 30: Endorsement of CSU Math Council Resolution Regarding Purpose of and Requirements for General Education Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning (“B4”) Courses and the ASCSU Resolution on Standards for Quantitative Reasoning AS-3308-17/APEP
17-18 CIC 32: Internship Course Descriptions
17-18 CIC 33: Health Sciences Prerequisite Policy
17-18 CIC 34: Grade Forgiveness Policy
17-18 CIC 35: Timeline for Curricular Changes
17-18 CIC 38 amended: Temporary continuation of GE B5 designation
17-18 CIC 39: Revised Clarification of B6 Standards
17-18 CIC 41: Updated Curricular Procedures Manual
17-18 CIC 42 revised: Revision Request for Online Teaching and Learning
17-18 CIC 44: SPED prefix for Special Education
17-18 CIC 45: SLHS prefix for Speech Language and Hearing Science
17-18 CIC 47: CIVE prefix for Civil Engineering

In addition, numerous revision requests, general education approvals, hybrid modifications, and course modification requests were completed and provided as information.

Committee on Budget and Resource Allocation (COBRA)
17-18 COBRA 1: Report on the CORE Building
17-18 COBRA 2: Status Update on the CORE Building
17-18 COBRA 3: Summary of the 2017-18 CSUEB Budget Highlights
17-18 COBRA 7: Statement of Budget Priorities

Committee on Research (CR)
17-18 CR 1: Institutional Review Board Annual Report
17-18 CR 3: Principal Investigator Policy
17-18 CR 5: Galindo Creek Field Station Proposal

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)
17-18 FAC 3 revised: Revisions to the Faculty Office Hour Policy and proposal for a new policy on Office Hours and Faculty Availability Outside of the Classroom
17-18 FAC 4 amended: Semester and schedule updates for the Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students
17-18 FAC 6: Recommended Changes to the Policy on Periodic Evaluation of
17-18 FAC 7 revised: Revision of academic calendar for AY18-19
17-18 FAC 8: Addition of note on Student Conduct to the CSUEB Common Syllabus
17-18 FAC 9: Suggested revisions to the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) policy
17-18 FAC 10: Revision of RTP Procedures for Semesters and for Electronic Submission of Dossiers

Other sources
17-18 FUFM 1: CFA East Bay Chapter Endorsement of 17-18 BEC 6 amended: Resolution Regarding Executive Orders 1100 (revised) and 1110
17-18 BAS 1: Revision of start date for AY 18-19
COMMITTEE ON BUDGET AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

2017-2018 Annual Report
Prepared by Nancy Mangold, Chair

Fall 2017

ExCom charged COBRA to provide a written report on its recommendations on the proposal for the CORE building by the end of January 2018. COBRA met with Debbie Chaw, VP Administration and Finance and others from Facilities on the CORE building on November 8 and December 13, 2017. COBRA prepared COBRA Report #1 that summarizes the background and history of the CORE building, current status, concerns expressed and COBRA’s recommendations based on the review of the presented materials on the CORE building.

Winter 2018

COBRA provided a status update and its recommendations on the CORE building in COBRA #2 on February 19, 2018.

COBRA invited Debbie Chaw, VP - Administration and Finance and CFO to present the 2017-18 CSUEB Budget Highlights on January 10, 2018. COBRA prepared COBRA #3 on February 22, 2018 that summarizes the CSU budget increase for 2017-18, CSUEB budget increase, CSUEB total sources of funds, the budget allocation to different divisions and other uses. COBRA #3 also highlights CSUEB and CSU budget challenges in the future.

Spring 2018

COBRA met with Debbie Chaw, VP - Administration and Finance and CFO, Glen Perry, AVP Special Projects, Project/Technical Co-Manager of Semester Conversion and Lindsay McCrea, Associate Director of Semester Conversion, on the CSUEB Semester Conversion Budget on February 28, 2018. COBRA #4 summarizes the Semester Conversion Budget at CSUEB. COBRA commended the Administration and Finance and Directors of Semester Conversion for their excellent work that resulted in a budget savings for the university from the semester conversion.

Brian Cook, AVP, University Extension (UE) and Jennifer Toor, Director of Fiscal Services, University Extension attended COBRA and presented University Extension’s Budget to COBRA on March 28, 2018. COBRA #6 summarizes the University Extension’s Budget, its contribution to the university and COBRA’s recommendation on UE’s budget. Significant issues discussed were large overhead charged to UE’s programs and the university has grown increasingly dependent upon the funds from UE. COBRA recommends that UE, AF and Provost Office meet to work out a more sustainable overhead charge that will be beneficial to UE programs in the long run.
Dr. Edward Inch, Provost and VP, Academic Affairs attended COBRA and presented Academic Affairs Budget to COBRA on April 11, 2018. COBRA #5 summarizes the Academic Affairs’ Budget at CSUEB and important budget challenges and initiatives for Academic Affairs. Without extra funding from the State and the decreasing one-time funds, there is a 4%-5% reduction in budget to all units of Academic Affairs for 2018-19. Significant concerns are the dependency on one-time funds, faculty workload, facility and the need for a sustainable budget model.

On May 9, 2018 COBRA developed a statement articulating the budget priorities advocated by the committee based on input provided over the course of the year. The committee presented the COBRA #7 budget priorities to the Academic Senate. COBRA #7 Statement on Budget Priorities was approved by the Senate in Spring 2018 and by the President in Summer 2018.
COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

2017-2018 Annual Report
Prepared by Cristian Gaedicke, PhD, PE, Chair

Committee Members: Reza Akhavian, Engineering (17-19); Jeffra Bussmann, Library (17-19); Elena Dukhovny, Communicative Sciences & Disorders (16-18); Cristian Gaedicke, Engineering (16-18); Jeremiah Garretson, Political Science (17-19); Brian Gonsalves, Psychology (17-19); Albert Gonzalez, Anthropology, Geography & Environmental Studies (16-18); Jeff Seitz, AVP of Research and Sponsored Programs, Presidential Appointee; Kate Strom, Educational Leadership (17-19); & Jiming Wu, Management (16-18)

Fall 2017

• 17-18 CR 2: Updated the Policies and Procedures for the Committee on Research
  The subcommittee policy was modified, the requirement of CR membership was removed. The Presidential Appointee was assigned as being responsible for reporting to CR regarding animal care and research.

• Faculty Workload Task Force Report
  An ad hoc committee to draft a proposal supportive of the FWTF was formed.

• Faculty Support Grant
  A diverse group of 11 faculty willing to become reviewers for FSG was formed. The review process was optimized, and conducted mostly online. Reviewed Faculty Support Grant proposals, and made recommendations to Provost Inch regarding which faculty the CR felt should be funded.

Winter 2018

• CSU Student Research Competition
  The rubric was revised and modified for purposes of increasing clarity and uniformity of interpretation between judges, including Clarity of Purpose, Appropriateness of Methodology, Interpretation of Results, and Value of Research or Creative Activity. Articulation and Organization category values reduced to 10% value per item and all others increased to 20% value in order to increase point values for rubrics associated with proposal substance.
The committee recommends that students should disclose the amount of faculty support that students may receive. It is unclear if some proposals received substantive faculty help in writing. In the future, the call may need to be revised to make it clear that student projects need to be completed and have results before the competition and that proposal should make clear what the results are.

- **Review of Research Culture Survey**
  Research culture survey questions were updated. However, the committee decided to postpone the Research Climate Survey (RCS) until we have information on semesters. Results may not be valid for the semester system if it goes out too soon.

- **ExCom Faculty Workload referral**
  A letter was drafted asking the Deans about workload policies planned for their colleges under Semesters. This is in response to ExCom’s charge to determine how colleges are setting up their new faculty workload policies.

**Spring 2018**

- **Open Access Journal request**
  The committee was asked to discuss and potentially draft a policy on Open Access Journals. L. Wood and V. Yingling presented about Open Access Journals at the committee. As there were differing views about such Journals among different disciplines, the committee decided against developing a university-wide policy.

- **ExCom Faculty Workload report**
  The summary of College responses regarding Faculty workload was summarized in report 17-18 CR 6 and forwarded to EXCOM.

- **Galindo Creek Field Station at Concord Campus**
  The proposal to create a field station at the Concord Campus was reviewed, discussed, approved, and referred to EXCOM.
TO: The Executive Committee

FROM: James Murray, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee

SUBJECT: Annual Report summarizing activities of FAC in AY17-18

PURPOSE: For information to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

ACTION REQUESTED: That the Executive Committee accepts this report.

FAC approved 10 new documents in AY17-18, selected winners of the Outstanding Faculty Awards, and awarded units to faculty for their Exceptional Service to Students. In addition, the Subcommittee on Evaluation of Teaching (SET) continued the process of exploring ideas about best practices in the evaluation of teaching including classroom observation by peer faculty.

17-18 FAC 2 ask Excom to appoint members to a special subcommittee to seek information and resources for understanding and responding to behavior that may be perceived as disruptive during faculty interactions with students. This committee will meet in Fall 2018.

17-18 FAC 7 revised changed the first semester calendar of AY18-19 to deal with some potential issues in scheduling duty days, exams, and grading due dates. There was considerable concerns expressed by many at Senate and these should be considered when revising the “15-16 FAC 10: 2015-2025 Ten-year, Quarter to Semester Transitional Calendar”.

Because of the issue on committee business transitioning from year to year, members of FAC asked if the Senate might facilitate or recommend a place to store draft documents, referral emails from other committees, supporting information, and other electronic files so that they are available to the Senate. Such a system would provide a workflow that anyone could view to allow new members to see previous working documents, and to enhance senate transparency.
The following FAC documents were passed and accepted or adopted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Excom Approved</th>
<th>Senate Approved</th>
<th>President Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-18 FAC 1</td>
<td>Annual Goals for FAC in AY17-18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18 FAC 2</td>
<td>Formation of Special Subcommittee to address disruptive behavior</td>
<td>2/27/18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18 FAC 3</td>
<td>Revisions to the Faculty Office Hour Policy and proposal for a new policy on Office Hours and Faculty Availability Outside of the Classroom</td>
<td>4/24/18</td>
<td>5/15/18</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18 FAC 4</td>
<td>Semester and schedule updates for the Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students</td>
<td>1/30/18</td>
<td>2/20/18 (further amended 3/6/18) see 17-18 BEC 9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18 FAC 5</td>
<td>FAC Subcommittee on Student Evaluations of Teaching name change</td>
<td>4/24/18</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18 FAC 6</td>
<td>Recommended Changes to the Policy on Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty</td>
<td>4/24/18</td>
<td>5/29/18</td>
<td>6/27/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18 FAC 7</td>
<td>Revision of academic calendar for AY18-19</td>
<td>4/10/18</td>
<td>5/15/18</td>
<td>6/14/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18 FAC 8</td>
<td>Addition of note on Student Conduct to the CSUEB Common Syllabus</td>
<td>4/24/18</td>
<td>5/29/18</td>
<td>6/27/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18 FAC 9</td>
<td>Suggested revisions to the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) policy</td>
<td>4/24/18</td>
<td>5/29/18</td>
<td>6/27/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Faculty Affairs Committee has issues and documents that could be carried over to AY18-19.

1. **15-16 FAC 8**: New CSU East Bay Policy on Emerita and Emeritus Status was referred back to FAC from Excom on 4-19-16. FAC referred this to the Lecturer Subcommittee since the status of Lecturers was a key issue, and the Lecturer subcommittee has not yet returned a policy to FAC.

2. Lecturer subcommittee also determined that changes are needed to improve the policy and to check compliance with Collective Bargaining Agreement.

3. **16-17 FAC 9**: Faculty Affairs committee received a referral from Excom in January 2016 to update this policy [POLICIES AND PROCEDURES GOVERNING FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN APPOINTMENT AND REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS] especially Appendix A that refers to administrative positions that no longer exist after reorganization. FAC have updated the positions covered by Appendix A “SEARCH COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP BY DIVISION”, made some changes in the membership of these committees to make committee makeup more consistent, added and removed some administrators from the list to align better with faculty interest and relevance, and made some updates in the body of policy. It was approved by the Senate but rejected by the president in 2017. Considering that the document is out of date and refers to entities that have been re-organized [Organizational chart from January 2018], FAC should discuss changes to the document that might result in approval by the president.

4. Excom referral to consider when to schedule Senate committee meetings considering the new semester time modules. They requested that the Faculty Affairs Committee study the issue in more depth and if appropriate make recommendations on meeting times beyond 2018-19. FAC may wish to consult with University Scheduling and with the soon-to-be formed Time Modules Task Force that will be evaluating the new schedule as part of the schedule’s three-year pilot. [http://www.csueastbay.edu/faculty/senate/files/docs/fac/17-18-fac/docs/meeting-times-email-mk-jam-5-13-18.pdf](http://www.csueastbay.edu/faculty/senate/files/docs/fac/17-18-fac/docs/meeting-times-email-mk-jam-5-13-18.pdf)

5. The Evaluation of Teaching subcommittee has made significant progress in discussing mechanisms for peer observation of faculty to help improve teaching effectiveness and to support demonstration of achievement in teaching dossiers. FAC may receive a ‘best practices’ document and ‘suggested peer observation procedure’ from the subcommittee in 18-19. They may also consider developing rubrics for assessing peer teaching performance in RTP.

6. The Awards subcommittee may consider developing rubrics for evaluation of faculty teaching, research, and service awards, and may also consider awards that are specific to Lecturers.

FAC may clarify language in Evaluation of Tenured Faculty to provide more detailed guidance about content of their portfolio and consider online submission.
SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE

TO: The Executive Committee
FROM: Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability
SUBJECT: Annual Report to the Senate for Academic Year 2017 - 2018
PURPOSE: To inform the Senate about the Activities of the Committee

ACTION REQUESTED: That the Executive Committee present this report to the Academic Senate as an Information Item.

Background

Article III, Section 1(4) of the Sustainability Committee Policies and Procedures for Committee Operation tasks the Sustainability Committee to:

Report to the Senate annually on the work of the Committee in carrying out the duties described in this section. As part of that report:

a. include a status report on sustainability affairs on campus, including but not limited to, monitoring progress toward meeting Senate Sustainability Resolution (06-07 BEC 9).

b. Include a status report on progress and barriers to achieving sustainability-related curricular and co-curricular commitments, policies, and goals, as related to duties describe in (2)a of this section.

This report fulfills that commitment, describing the main work of the Sustainability Committee (henceforth, the Committee) in Academic Year 2017-2018 (AY17-18), with the content approved in AY17-18.
Progress Toward Achieving Sustainability Commitments and Committee Contributions Thereto

Throughout the year the Committee tracked progress toward achieving the University’s sustainability goals: academic, structural, and operational. As described below, while major sustainability milestones were achieved in AY17-18, some serious shortfalls persist.

AY17-18 marked significant progress toward achieving Senate Sustainability Resolution (06-07 BEC 9), in which the body “Resolved that the Academic Senate of CSU East Bay supports actions to make climate neutrality and sustainability a part of the curriculum (including campus facilities and grounds as learning laboratories) and other educational experience for all students” [emphasis added]. Specifically, the General Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Instruction and Curriculum spent the year evaluating and approving Sustainability Overlay (SO) courses. Beginning with the Fall 2018 calendar, all students are required to take at least one Sustainability Overlay course. The Catalog currently lists 41 SO courses in 15 different programs that satisfy the overlay. Fall 2018 marks the first time in the history of the university that a sustainability course is required of all students—a major milestone toward fulfilling the Resolution.

Unfortunately, the Committee also notes that the University currently has no plan in place to meet its resolution to make climate neutrality a part of the curriculum for all students. Moreover, that commitment is also included in the University’s Carbon Commitment, signed by President Morishita in January of 2015. While climate neutrality can be, and in some cases clearly is, the subject of SO courses, there is no requirement that it must be, and it is clearly not the subject in many cases. Therefore, it appears that the University still falls far short of achieving its goal of having all students study this critically important sustainability issue. This is an issue that the Committee should take up in AY18-19, given that it lies at the heart of its mandate.

On the other hand, the University did make major progress more generally on climate action by adopting its first Climate Action Plan 2018. The 113-page Plan marks the university’s commitment to achieve carbon neutrality by 2040 and lays out a pathway to do so. Notably the development of the Plan was led by faculty, in collaboration with staff, and with the intensive involvement of students in classes, internships, and in one case, as a AmeriCorps Climate Corps Fellow. The Plan was reviewed and endorsed by the Committee on February 16, 2018, and was signed by the President on April 30, 2018, finalizing the multi-stage approval and adoption process.

At the referral of the Executive Committee, the Committee, investigated progress toward incorporating the University’s sustainability goals in the development of the CORE building (17-18 CAHS 1). Based on that investigation, the Committee found that, while important sustainability elements were being included in the design process, specifically the zero net energy (ZNE) specification, the potential to leverage the process to improve sustainability education on campus were largely neglected. Furthermore, promises to remediate these issues had not been corrected by the end of the year.
Specifically:

- Facilities management indicated that it “seeks to match opportunities with academic departments that can host [student] internships”; yet it had not reached out to relevant faculty by the end of the Spring quarter to the knowledge of the Committee.

- “The Committee [also recommended] that ExCom formally request that Facilities Management include faculty…to participate in the CORE Building Design Process”, because of its professional development potential for faculty doing related work. This recommendation too was not followed up on by Facilities Management.

This is another issue that should be addressed in AY18-19, particularly given that another new building is on the horizon.

**The Sustainability Minor: Promoting Sustainability Curriculum Development and Inter-College Collaboration**

Article III, Section 1(2) of the Sustainability Committee Policies and Procedures for Committee Operation tasks the Committee to “Promote sustainability as a focus of curricular and co-curricular activities, consistent with the University’s sustainability commitments and goals”.

To deepen sustainability education among ‘non-majors’ (that is for students not majoring in Environmental Studies or Environmental Science, both of which are heavily focused on the issue by nature) and to expand exposure to carbon neutrality courses, the Committee continued to pursue the development of a Sustainability Minor “Designed for students in any major to gain an understanding of the global sustainability crisis, strategies for solutions, and how to apply that understanding to their own lives and potentially to their careers.” This has been a multi-year endeavor interacting with broader efforts to create a system-wide Sustainability Minor.

As shown in the figure below, the Committee recommends that the Minor include three levels of courses structured as follows:

- Level 1 consists of one lower division Sustainability Overlay course;

- Level 2 consists of
  - one upper division Sustainability Overlay course,
  - one course on Sustainable and Socially Just Communities,
  - and one on Carbon Neutrality taken in three different departments;

- Level 3 consists of one upper division Sustainability Capstone course.

The committee developed recommendations for descriptions and SLOs for each of the new course designations (see Appendix A).
The Committee also worked with Dean Maureen Scharberg to draft a Charter for participating programs and to discuss administrative arrangements for this unique program, which will not be housed in any department in order to maintain its purpose of encouraging sustainability academics across the University creating and deepening faculty knowledge in the subject through continuing working interactions. To facilitate this, the plan is to house the program in Academic Programs and Services. To date nine programs across three colleges (CLASS, CoS, and Business) and the Library have collaborated in this endeavor. The entire package of materials is being passed to the AY 18-19 Sustainability Committee for completion.

Other Work of the Sustainability Committee

In addition to other duties discussed above, Article III, Section 1 of the Sustainability Committee Policies and Procedures for Committee Operation tasks the Committee to:

1. Make policy recommendations to the Academic Senate regarding means to achieve the University's sustainability commitments and goals.

2. Promote opportunities for sustainability research and scholarship.

The fulfill these duties:

- The Committee reviewed and unanimously endorsed the preservation of the creek area and wetlands on the Concord Campus as a biological field station for faculty research and learning.

- We also supported academic activities at Earth Week, where three of the members (Garbesi, Smith, and Oikawa) presented Sustainability work in the form of Ignite Talks.

- More significantly, Committee engaged in extensive dialog with the Faculty Affairs Committee regarding amendments to the Retention Tenure and Promotion (RTP) document with the goal of embedding recognition of faculty work in support the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)
into the RTP process. It is a widely recommended best practice to reflect the mission and goals of the university in RTP (articulated in the ILOs), particularly where it involves interdisciplinary work, because of the inherent structural barriers to interdisciplinary work at most universities. The Committee recognized that the subject of sustainability is inherently interdisciplinary, thus the enhanced importance of recognizing such work explicitly in the RTP process. After much negotiation, 17-18 FAC 10 added sections 4.2.7, 4.3.9, 4.4.4, and 4.5.3 for that purpose, identifying contributions to the ILOs in all four pillars of faculty work (instructional achievement, professional achievement, university service, and community service). 17-18 FAC 10 was approved by the President on June 27, 2018.

APPENDIX A.
Course Categories included in the Sustainability Minor: Descriptions and Student Learning Outcomes

Recommended Guidelines for Climate Neutrality Courses
- Climate Neutrality Courses discuss, investigate, analyze, and interpret questions regarding the actions, strategies, and mechanisms necessary to achieve climate neutrality.

SLOs for Climate Neutrality Courses
Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:
(1) Identify the causes of anthropogenic climate disruption including the historic and current sources of greenhouse gas emissions, and energy’s contribution thereto.
(2) Explain the meaning of climate neutrality, the magnitude of greenhouse gas emissions reductions needed, and the timeframe in which it needs to be achieved.
(3) Analyze factors that determine the relative credibility of different sources of information on climate science.
(4) Describe the process of modeling future climates and incorporating scientific uncertainty into decision making.
(5) Evaluate the risks to the global biosphere and human populations of the continuing anthropogenic climate change.
(6) Identify the diverse interests of different stakeholders in the context of achieving climate neutrality.
(7) Describe solutions discussed and implemented by the international community to address anthropogenic climate disruption, including energy-related solutions, and create their own response toward that goal.

Recommended Guidelines for Sustainable and Socially Just Communities Courses
-Sustainable and Socially Just Communities Courses discuss, investigate, analyze, and interpret questions regarding the actions, strategies, and mechanisms necessary to create sustainable and socially just communities.

SLOs for Sustainable and Socially Just Communities Course
Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:
(1) Identify the disproportional socio-economic impacts of anthropogenic climate change on diverse human communities.

(2) Describe and explain specific indigenous knowledge traditions, and cultural ways of mitigating ecosystem change and creating sustainable communities.

(3) Critically integrate the relationships among intersecting and conflicting narratives of sustainability and social justice.

(4) Assess advocacy programs and policy narratives on sustainability that draw from de-colonial thought and histories of social justice.

(5) Identify how human-environment interactions and pro-environmental behavior are individually embodied.

**Recommended Guidelines for Sustainable Capstone Courses**

Capstone courses apply students’ sustainability education toward a solution for an actual sustainability problem. Prerequisites: A minimum of 9 units consisting of the following three courses in the Sustainability Minor: a lower division Sustainability Overlay course, a Climate Neutrality course, and a Sustainable and Socially Just Communities course

**SLOs for Sustainable Capstone Course**

Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:

(1) Apply their sustainability education to an experiential-learning project that addresses a solution for an actual sustainability problem.

(2) Produce a substantial written analysis or synthesis of the project addressing its sustainability impact. (e.g., a written report, a website, a script for a documentary film, an analysis or contextualization of a creative/interpretative/art project)
Mission

The University Honors Program provides outstanding students the opportunity for academic challenge through the completion of specialized courses, seminars and projects under the direction of faculty mentors!

Components of the Program

The centerpiece of the honors program are the student honors projects. Depending on when the student entered the UHP, they are required to complete five or four of such projects. Every honors project is tied to a course. Students must design, plan, and execute an original research or creative project in consultation with the course instructor, who agrees to evaluate the honors project in addition to, and separate from, assignments and assessment for the course in which the student is enrolled. Honors-designated courses may be in the student’s major or minor, as well as in General Education and elective courses. To count as an Honors course, the student should also have received a letter grade of “B” or better.

Students also must take GS3099 (Honors Leadership and Service) and GS3999 (Honors Seminar). Students also are required to attend one or more special learning, professional development, or cultural events at CSUEB each quarter in which they are enrolled in the University Honors Program.

Admission

Admission to the program is open to students who have maintained a 3.60 GPA in their last 36 quarter (or equivalent semester) units of baccalaureate-level coursework, transfer students who have maintained a minimum 3.60 GPA in their most recent three quarters and 36 units of coursework (or two semesters and 24 units) at their prior college or university. To ensure enough time to complete honors requirements, all students also must expect to be at CSUEB for at least another two years.

Faculty Director and Advisory Council

Director: Professor Shirley Yap, Department of Mathematics, appointed in Spring 2017.

Honors Advisory Council:

- Professor Nina Haft (Theatre and Dance, CLASS)
- Assistant Professor SaeHya Ann (Hospitality, Recreation, Tourism, CEAS)
- Professor Lindsay McCrea (Nursing, CoS)
- Professor Tammie Simmons-Mosley (Accounting and Finance, CBE)

Program Expenses

- Staffing dedication: Administrative Support Coordinator, APS
- Director's release time: 12 units per year
- Courses: Two sections each of GS 3099 (GS 309 in Semesters), “Honors Leadership and Service” and GS 3999 (GS 399 in Semesters), “Honors Seminar,” per year

GS 3099 Recent Community Partners
- Alameda County Office of Education - Project EAT
- Hayward Public Library
- Monument Crisis Center
- Our Lady of Grace School
- Peer Health Exchange
- Scientific Adventures for Girls
- Soccer Without Borders
- The Arc of Alameda County
- Alameda County Community Food Bank
- Downtown Streets Team
- Hayward Chamber of Commerce
- MedShare International
- Oakland International High School
- Reading Partners
- San Francisco Veteran Affairs Medical Center
- Sun Gallery
- Tri-City Volunteers
2017-2018 Developments and Initiatives

The past academic year was filled with changes to the UHP. One of my goals as Director has been to create synergistic relationships with other CSUEB programs for high achieving students. To that end, I and Director of the Center for Student Research Dr. Jenny O collaborated in summer 2017 to create some joint programming for the 2017-2018 Academic Year. The rationale was that these students could help each other persevere and share ideas and resources. This collaboration was a bit hit; the CSR had a speaker series and UHP students participated in it. What they did was do to reflect on their college experience so far, the choices they made, why they made them, their thoughts about what they want out of the university experience and how they were going to achieve those goals. I hope to do more programming with the CSR in the future.

Like all other programs in the CSUEB, 2017-2018 was also a time of preparation for Semester Conversion. A significant, new development for the UHP under semesters is the Honors Freshman Learning Cluster (developed by former UHP director Dr. Briget Ford), whose entry would be solely based upon high school GPA. The intention of this cluster was to make the Honors FLC the primary entry point for the UHP. However, I and some members of the Honors Advisory Council were concerned about a.) the historically high rate of attrition of freshmen students out of the UHP and b.) transfer student inclusion into the UHP, given that they would be unable to take the Honors FLC. A compromise then was made that while Honors FLC students would be encouraged to apply for the UHP, that they would not gain immediate entry into the UHP solely by virtue of their acceptance into the Honors FLC.

Another initiative I have undertaken is to analyze the data we have for the program, which, to my knowledge, has never been done for the program in a director’s report, or in any other format. Further on in this document, I present data about the UHP, followed by data-driven ideas about future initiatives for the program.

One of the most significant changes to the program was the retirement of long-time administrative coordinator, Rita Amador, who had served the UHP for many years. Rita had taken a medical leave from October to December, and I assumed her duties during her absence. She then retired shortly after she came back. Since the faculty directors are only part-time, and their tenure is generally a few years, Rita carried the institutional memory of the program through directorships.

Rita’s retirement in December dealt a huge blow to the program. Rita knew the program, its’ history, and the students very well. Because Rita had been with the program for so many years, the business processes of the program had stayed mostly the same during Rita’s tenure.

When Rita retired in December, Interim Associate Dean Mitch Watnik, to whom I report, told me that I had to take over Rita’s job but that a replacement would be hired in a few weeks (as of this writing, in early June, nobody has yet been hired). I proceeded to study hundreds of past documents from the program, which is when I could see that the program could benefit greatly from streamlining and automating the honors processes not only to make the program easier for students progress, but also to facilitate the hand-overs between UHP administrative coordinators and UHP directors.

Tracking of student progress was done entirely by hand in an Excel spreadsheet, individual student inquiries were made from the registrar’s office, the contract system was entirely paper-based, the application process was both paper and web-form based, the honors room access process was paper-based, and there were a variety of places students had to go to conduct UHP business. They had to hand in paper forms to the UHP office for all their contracts, and to fill out other forms, such as the honors room key form. They also went to the CSUEB UHP website, which wasn’t frequently updated, and some of them used the BaySync Honors website.
I built up the BaySync portal to be a one-stop experience for students. The objects I created on the BaySync portal to help students, participating faculty, future administrators, and directors include:

- A video for students and potential honors project faculty explaining the contract process and purpose
- Online forms for their contracts
- Online forms for their progress reports
- Online application to the UHP
- Online form to register for GS309 and GS399 (registration for these courses requires permission numbers)
- A home page describing the honors program in detail, including links to important forms
- A lengthy Frequently Asked Questions page
- Online repository for honors projects
- Online form for submitting participation in an academic activity (required each quarter)
- Online forms tracking student and faculty attendance for Honors Convocation

A major achievement in the development of this online hub is the speed at which everyone can get on board the UHP program. UHP students need only go to one place to conduct all their UHP business. Moreover, future administrators of the program - faculty, administrative coordinators, and directors, can learn about the program quickly, as well as manage the program much more easily and efficiently. Content is easy found, organized, and managed. Furthermore, communication between students and the director is now both easy, and managed in a larger system, which is regularly backed up.

Data Analysis

Gender Distribution
Distribution of Majors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Juan High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Mary's High School Stockton, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linden High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreau Catholic High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame High School Belmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro Valley High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboreyhaan (Iran)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Francis Polytechnic High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosumnes Oaks High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurukul Global School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encinal High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramount High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont Hills High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark Memorial High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colegio Academios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop O'Dowd High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton Valley Charter High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBSE, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL RANCHO VERDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlaken High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Alternative High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Kennedy High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Academy, New Delhi, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista High, Bakersfield, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balboa High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence International Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Beach High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workman High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GADPS, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Creek High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. O’Connell High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caruthers High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Kennedy High School Fremont, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dougherty Valley High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Heart Cathedral Preparatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceres High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont Hills High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abroad High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granados Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Technical High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Roosevelt High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrew P. Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Judy Irie Burton Technology Academy High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse M. Behr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMK Kelana Jaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph Notre Dame High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland School for the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Kennedy High School Fremont, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salinas high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred C Beyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar Chavez High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar alltinker sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casto Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Free Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindhurst High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald E. McNair High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra Nova High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay Arts High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlands East Valley High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreau Catholic High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orion Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granada Hills Charter High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm public charter school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspire Golden State College Preparatory Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John C. Kimball High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowdale High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data indicates that

- 35 majors are represented in the UHP. Given that there are around 40 departments in the university, 35 is not a bad representation of the university.
- However, the Nursing, Business Administration and Biological Science account for 42% of the UHP students. Nursing alone constitutes for 18% of the UHP student population.
- Women make up over 75% of the UHP population.
- Most of the gender disparity comes from Nursing, where there are 30 women and 2 men. Biological Sciences also contributes; there are twice as many women as men.
- UHP students come from 145 different high schools. The school from which the most number of UHP students have come is James Logan high school, with 6.
- Hispanics and Asians make up about 3/5 of the UHP population.

One clear outcome of this data analysis is that students need to be recruited from a larger variety of majors. Also, it would probably be helpful to breakdown the ethnic category of "Asian" into a few distinct groups.
Goals and Ideas for the near and indeterminate future

- Updating student surveys to include more demographic information (such as Pell Eligibility, etc.)
- Regular data analysis
- An honors residential floor in the dormitories
- Honors scholarships (best project, highest GPA, etc.)
- Participation in the National Collegiate Honors Council
Institutional Review Board Annual Report
June 16, 2017 – June 15, 2018

As stated in 80-81 BEC 2, the Assurance of Compliance with Department of Health and Human Services Regulations on Protection of Human Subjects, the Chair of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) shall report annually to the AVP of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, and through the Chair of the Committee on Research to the Chair of the Academic Senate.

80-81 BEC 2 states that the annual report must contain six elements:

1) The dates of all IRB meetings and the attendance.

Most human subjects research conducted at CSUEB is of minimal risk and is evaluated via administrative or expedited review, which is coordinated via campus mail and email. No full board meetings were held in academic year 2017-2018.

2) The total number of projects and activities reviewed, including statistics on expedited reviews, approvals, rejections, and deferred protocols.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Review</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff-Initiated</th>
<th>Student-Initiated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Board</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedited Review</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuation Review</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modification Review</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt Protocols</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not HSR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance Agreement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 80 219 299

The categories above reflect those used in the federal regulations governing IRB operations. Protocols undergoing full board review are reviewed by a quorum of board members at an in-person board meeting. Protocols undergoing expedited review are reviewed by the IRB chair and a subset of the board, typically using email correspondence. Protocols undergoing exempt review are reviewed by the IRB chair alone. 288 of the 299 protocols submitted to the IRB were approved, either via full board, expedited or exempt review of new, modified, or renewed research protocols. Two (2) of the remaining protocols require additional information for review. The information was requested but had not been received at the time of this report. Seven (7) of the protocols submitted were found not to be considered human subjects research. Such research does not require the approval of the IRB. Two (2) of the protocols were withdrawn by the investigator. In one case, a student-initiated protocol described a class
project where class projects do not require IRB review. The second was determined to be a Quality Improvement (QI) project, also which do not require IRB review.

Compared to last year, the number of faculty/staff-initiated protocols was somewhat lower (80 vs. 104) while the number of student-initiated protocols was similar (219 vs. 230.) The total number of submitted protocols was somewhat lower (299 vs. 334).

Note that the Departments of Teacher Education, Educational Psychology, and Educational Leadership submit their students’ Master’s theses projects for Board approval. Four sections of these students account for approximately 60 of the above student-initiated protocols. Protocols from Master’s of Social Work students accounted for another 5-10 protocols.

The board instituted a training policy for investigators conducting research using human subjects which was approved by the Academic Senate on June 3, 2008. The training program was implemented by subscribing to the CITI Human Subjects Research Training program, an online training program hosted by the University of Miami. Compliance with the training requirement was required for investigators submitting protocols and all IRB members from Spring quarter 2009 onward. The ORSP maintains a database of investigators who have completed the training. During the year covered by this report, faculty, staff, and student investigators completed 584 training programs.

3) The current membership of the Board with terms of appointment indicated.

The board is made up of eleven (11) members and an equal number of alternates. Both members and alternates participate equally in reviewing protocols. A distinction is only made during full board meetings as required by federal regulation.

**Members:**

1. Jeffra Bussmann, Chair, Committee on Research  
2. Kevin Brown, Chair, Computer Science  
3. Anne Wing, IRB Coordinator, ORSP  
4. Ann Halvorsen, Educational Psychology  
5. Kimberly Kim, Nursing and Health Sciences  
6. Elana Dukhovny, Communicative Sciences and Disorders  
7. Leonardo R. Arriola, Community Representative  
8. Toni Naccarato, Social Work  
9. Richard Sprott, Human Development  
10. Jessica Weiss, History  
11. Andrea Wilson, Director, Student Health Service

**Term Ends:**

- Ex-officio
- Fall 2019
- Fall 2018
- Fall 2019
- Fall 2018
- Fall 2020
- Fall 2020
- Fall 2020
- Fall 2018
- Fall 2020
- Ex-officio

**Alternates:**

1. John Eros, Music  
2. David Fencsik, Psychology  
3. Silvina Ituarte, Criminal Justice Administration  
4. Will Johnson, Sociology and Social Services

**Term Ends:**

- Fall 2020
- Fall 2020
- Fall 2020
- Fall 2020
4) A citation of current, relevant legislation and regulatory requirements which govern the actions of the IRB.


5) Notes on developments at the national, state, local community and university levels that may require policy revisions to provide assurance as defined by Federal regulations, changes, or addenda or other administrative attention or action.

The U.S Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and fifteen other Federal Departments and Agencies have issued final revisions to the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects (the Common Rule). These revisions were approved by the Obama administration and most provisions were to take effect January 19, 2018. The effective date of the Revised Common Rule has been delayed two times. The current date that they will take effect is January 21, 2019

When the changes do become effective, CSUEB policy must be updated to conform to the new regulations. Most of the changes concern handling of bio-specimens, a new limited review process, and the requirement for single-IRB approval of multi-site projects. CSUEB has seen little or no research using bio-specimens, allowing for straight-forward implementation of the new requirements in that regard. Limited review will need to be defined for our campus, and may affect current policies and procedures. Single-site review policies and documents will also need to be developed. Due to the complexity involved, single-site review provisions of the revised Common rule are not to take effect until January 20, 2020.

The Council on Governmental Regulations (COGR) has engaged in conversations with the Human Subjects Research Protection Officer, National Science Foundation, regarding applications and proposals lacking definite plans for involvement of human subjects. Per 45 CFR 690.118, applications lacking definite plans, such as “projects in which human subjects’ involvement will depend upon completion of instruments, prior animal studies, or purification of compounds,” need not be reviewed by an IRB before an award is made. NSF has indicated that for studies that meet these criteria, IRBs may use a “Preliminary Approval” notice for NSF projects and that this approval is consistent with the Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide. The draft letter provides a limited approval period and indicates that the investigator must submit an amendment or new IRB
application for full IRB approval of the project prior to the expiration date. It also emphasizes that no work with human subjects, including recruitment, may be conducted under the determination. Establishing a time limit, whether it is 3 or 6 months, requires investigators to return to the IRB and establishes accountability. The CSUEB ORSP and IRB are aware of this policy and will comply when reviewing new NSF grant applications.

6) Recommendations for administrative or Academic Senate actions for maintaining an effective institutional review function for the purpose of protecting the rights and welfare of human subjects.

The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs is continuing to evaluate potential grant management software packages that include electronic IRB components. Such a system would allow investigators to submit research protocols and accompanying materials electronically, and to track their submissions as they go through the review process. Results of the evaluation will be presented to the Committee on Research for further action.

A discussion was begun this year in the CSU-IRB group, made up of IRB chairs and coordinators throughout the CSU system, regarding the appropriate oversight to the respective campus IRBs. Some campus IRBs are overseen through a senate committee and others are overseen through administrative offices such as the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. It may be fruitful to start a discussion at CSUEB to determine which mode of oversight is most appropriate and efficient.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Brown
Chair, Institutional Review Board
To: Academic Senate
From: Jason A Smith, CAPR Chair AY 17 – 18
Date: 2018-09-07
RE: Summary of CAPR activity AY 17 – 18

The Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR) focused on two key issues in AY 17 – 18 in addition to its regular work of reviewing Annual Reports—building relationships with Academic Affairs and strengthening CAPR’s role in resource allocation and program review; updating CAPR documentation to reflect the transition to semesters. CAPR also sought to emphasize the role of assessment in campus life and the importance of an iterative view of assessment for the University Faculty in performing their governance functions.

There were no Five-Year Program Reviews in AY 17-18. Five Year Reviews will resume in AY 18 – 19.

CAPR had the following members in AY 17 – 18:

- Duke Austin, Sociology & Social Sci. CLASS
- David Fencsik, Psychology, CSCI
- Dawna Komorosky, Criminal Justice, CLASS
- Michele Korb, TED, CEAS
- Cherie Randolph, Veteran Student Services, SSP
- Jason Smith, Health Sciences, CSCI
- John Tan, Accounting & Finance, CBE
- Rose Wong, Social Work, CLASS
- Lana Wood, LIB Nidhi Khosla, Health Sciences, CSCI

I want to commend the CAPR members for their hard work this year, particularly around the issues of assessment, program review and resources. This discussion is only a summary. For a detailed list of CAPR documents and actions, please refer to the CAPR website.

CAPR, Program Review and Resource Allocation

CAPR spent the majority of the academic year focused on updating the program review process. The goal of these updates was to clarify the process, better link the Annual Program Review to resource allocation, and simplify reporting requirements for Departments and Programs. I believe CAPR was successful in these efforts with the Provost’s Office relying on these documents in the tenure-track allocation process. CAPR also provided a summary of the Annual Reports to the Senate. (See, 17-18 CAPR 3 – 7).

Updating Program Review Documents

CAPR also updated the timetables, documents and materials to reflect changes of dates and timetables. (17-18 CAPR 4). CAPR also clarified the discontinuance polices for programs to make them more transparent and explicit. (17-18 CAPR 5).

Other Actions

CAPR also approved various program and option discontinuances, name changes, and other programmatic changes as requested. (17-18 CAPR 1 et seq.)