Approved Minutes of the May 6, 2010 Meeting

Present: James Ahiakpor, Don Gailey, Pat Jennings, Michael Lee, Monique Manopoulos, Tuyen Nguyen, Chung-Hsing Ouyang, Nancy White, Donna Wiley
Absent: Liz Ginno
Guests: Toni Fogarty PAUD; Dean Badejo

1. Approval of the Agenda

   M/S/P (Pat; Tuyen)

2. Approval of the Prior Minutes

   4/15 Minutes
   Amend to add Monique Manopoulos (present) & Toni Fogarty (guest)
   M/S/P (Michael; Pat)
   1 abstention

   4/29 Minutes
   Amend to add Monique’s name to the minutes
   M/S/P (Ghung-Hsing; Pat)
   1 abstention

3. Report of the Chair

   No report

   However, Michael informed the committee that he worked on finalizing list of ILOs. They were sent to the Academic Senate Office.

   Pat reported that the Senate voted to pass Sociology’s proposal to suspend the graduate program.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee

   Item 1.
   Donna Wiley indicated that Susan Correa requested the status of our annual reports. Michael will get them posted on Sharepoint. The reports are to be divided among committee members. Committee members will have one week to work on them. Michael will provide the committee with a rubric to use a guideline for reading and summarizing the reports. Sue asked how many we have. Michael is not sure. Michael indicated that he sent 3 follow-ups to Chairs.

   **Michael checked on the number of annual reports after the meeting:**
   There are 13 annual reports and a bundle (combined report from CEAS).

   Item 2.
   Donna stated that it is not clear how the ILOs will be processed. Need to have some “buy in” from a faculty body. Donna spoke with Dianne Rush Woods. Diane indicated that
the Senate feels that there should be a Senate adoption of the ILOs. Diane recognizes that this is a first draft. She stated that the ILOs will come to the Senate and be sent back to the CAPR subcommittee for revision. The final revised version will come back to the Senate for approval.

Michael indicated that the process was not clear in the initial charge from Excom. His understanding was that the CAPR draft is simply a first step. He will ask for clarification from Excom next week. Michael doesn’t think Excom envisioned the entire process when they sent CAPR the initial charge. Michael stated that, “We have done a good faith job to complete Excom’s charge. Now we need clarification on the process.”

5. New business

a. CAPR 5 year Program Review for MPA

Moved to open the agenda item
M/S/P (James; Monique)

Michael provided an overview of the history of the review. The original report was returned to Public Administration so that they could provide new material and respond to the outside reviewer’s comments. In a comparison of the original review and the revised version, Michael found that the biggest change was the response to the outside reviewer’s report and the summary. Toni noted that they also responded more directly to learning outcomes (assessment), and they included the progress report. A key focus of the revised review was on the charge of “grade trading” by the outside reviewer. Michael indicated that he noted that this charge was not substantiated in his revision of the CAPR report, and he reflected the program’s effort to address this charge. Michael also summarized the problem areas in the report and the program’s efforts to correct them.

Michael’s conclusion: Accept the review and continue the program without modification, but CAPR needs to make a special effort to work with the program to ensure that they are moving toward re-accreditation. This is not annual monitoring, but we need to pay special attention to the yearly reports.

Toni’s Comments:

Toni indicated that she has no objection to annual scrutiny. However, some minor items need to be corrected in the CAPR report.

Item a. Toni is not the interim Chair; she is the Chair. Do not need to correct this in the document because she was the interim chair when the report was written. She is now the Chair.

Item b. (Pg. 1, middle of the paragraph under “Background”) The CAPR report refers to program as MA-change to MPA.

Item c. (Pg. 4, last sentence under the sub-section titled, “Students, Advising, and Retention”) The CAPR report indicates that “48 units are required for graduation of
which 20 are foundational…” This is incorrect. The 20 units are not part of the 48. The 20 foundational units are in addition to the 48 units.

Item d. (Under Section 3.1 of the Five-Year Review & pg. 7, paragraph 1 of the CAPR report) The outside reviewer noted a concern that the Public Administration is not following a plan. The CAPR report noted this comment and indicated that this is of concern to CAPR. Toni indicated that the reviewer was actually referring to CAPR in this statement. The reviewer incorrectly noted that CAPR was not requiring the program to follow a Five-Year Review plan. We should change this to read that, “The MPA Program was following CAPR requirements and protocol.” Michael stated that he could change the statement to read, “The reviewer erroneously noted that the program was not following a plan.” James suggested that we take the paragraph out. Toni indicated that this section is referring to the concerns that the reviewer had. Michael indicated that we should only be focusing on CAPR’s concerns, so we can take it out. Michael re-read the section in the Five-Year Review and noted that it is confusing as it is currently written. Michael suggested that the program revise the section and clarify the reviewer’s concerns. Toni will revise the review and Michael will revisit and rewrite the CAPR report once this is completed. It will be sent forward based on the condition that the section is revised.

CAPR members’ comments:
James noted that we need to add Professor after Lisa Faulkner, Assistant (professor is missing).

Tuyen noted that on pg. 1, second to the last sentence under “Background,” we need to add “n” to “give.” The sentence now reads, “…had been give chance to study…”

Don suggested that the double)) be removed on pg. 2 under “CAPR Recommendation for Continuation of the Program.” This sparked a discussion of the content in the ()).

Donna suggested that we strike the sentence starting with “However, CAPR suggests…,” and change it to, “In light of the MPA Program being denied re-accreditation in August 2008, and in order to ensure that it is making progress toward re-establishing its accreditation, CAPR will pay particular attention to the annual reports.” This has the function of removing “annual monitoring” from the language. Sue will mock up suggested language.

Michael indicated that he wants to emphasize that the annual reports are used to support the program’s efforts for re-accreditation. He is willing to put into language “support for re-accreditation.” The committee agreed that we should use Donna’s language.

Don asked if the work “forced” could be removed from the reference to the Chair (i.e., “The Chair was forced to resign.”). Michael indicated that that is Toni’s phrase. James suggested that we change to “ask” if we want to soften the language. Toni indicated that she wanted the report to reflect the destabilization and demoralization that this brought to the program. Toni indicated that she will attend the Senate meeting and defend the use of “forced”. The committee agreed to keep “forced”.

Last page on the third line under point #3; change the word wit to with.
Michael read, and asked for feedback on, the four points on pg 9 to the committee.

Point 1:
Need to change point one since it is no longer valid. Donna asked if the role of the graduate coordinator still exists. In this section, we should specify who will take on the duties of graduate coordinator. Point 1 should also relate to the fact that the program needs additional faculty—has insufficient faculty for a program of this size. Donna indicated that some place in Point 1, we need to point out the need for a graduate coordinator. Toni asked if we can add a note about the need for staff. Michael stated that he will re-orient the content covered in Point 1 so that it reflects the need for consolidation and leadership, assessment and advisement, sufficient faculty and sufficient staff support.

Point 2:
Language is fine.

Point 3:
Language is fine.

Point 4:
Pat asked if, by asking that the program evaluate faculty grading standards, we are holding PUAD to a standard that other programs are not held to. Donna replied that there is a history of asking programs to do this when there is suspicion that grade inflation has occurred. Toni suggested that one problem in the paragraph is that we are marrying grade standards with course evaluation standards. “Shouldn’t the focus be on course evaluations?” Michael indicted that we do need to address the charge of “selling grades” because it hangs out there in the review—the accusation is not confirmed nor disconfirmed. James indicated that he is okay with the wording as it is. He suggested that we should recognize that standards matter. Michael stated that it is not up to CAPR to reflect the method by which grading should be evaluated? Don asked if it is crucial to specify the source of the allegation. Toni responded that the allegation came up in a meeting that the outside reviewer held with 30 of the MPA students. This is reflected in the report.

Final decision: Keep the language as it is.

Donna stated that there is a leap between the first and second sentence under Point 4. She indicated that we need to be more specific about other issues listed, such as low academic standards, advising quality, etc. Donna suggested that we break Point 4 up into two separate points and expand on “other issues.” Toni stated that these points have been addressed by the program. Michael stated that he will put in a point break after the first sentence indicating that these points are being addressed by the program and CAPR encourages that they continue in these efforts.

Donna indicated that issues with the program on the Concord campus are noted in the review but not in the CAPR report. Toni stated that in reality no new cohort is entering into the program on the Concord campus. Michael suggested that we insert language at
the end of Point 1 that reads, “Without sufficient resources the ability to maintain the program at Concord is in doubt.” The committee agreed.

James noted that the language in the last paragraph on page 9 needs to change to reflect the recommendations. This has already been marked up by Donna.

**Committee Decision:**
Michael will make revisions and send to the committee. We will then vote by e-mail since the final version needs to be completed before our next meeting.

**NO vote:** The committee will read the revised draft and respond. The report will be sent forward at that time.

6. Old Business

None

7. Other business

None

8. Adjournment

M/S/P (Donna; Chung-Hsing) at 3:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Pat Jennings, Secretary
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