Minutes of the Meeting of October 21, 1999

Members Present: Tom Acord-Chair, Asoke Basu, Sandra Heisey, Jennifer Laherty, Jose Lopez, Frank Martino, Bijan Mashaw, Susan Opp, Mary Timney

Guests: Dr. Don Chu (CSU Chico): CSU Executive Fellow for 1999-2000 and Jay Tontz

Members Absent: Michael Hedrick (excused), Jane Lopus

The meeting was called to order by Chair Tom Acord at 2:05 P.M. in the President's Conference Room.

1. Approval of Agenda: M/S/P

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of October 7, 1999: M/S/P

3. Report of the Chair:

Chair introduced our guest, Dr. Don Chu (CSU Chico), who is the CSU Executive Fellow for 1999-2000.

On November 4, 1999 CAPR will examine the Ethnic Studies Five Year Program Review. Also on November 4, 1999 CAPR will review the summation report of the Art Five Year Program Review.

Chair spoke with AS Chair, Emily Stoper, and she likes our approach to resolving the Anamended@minutes problem.


5. Five Year Program Review - School of Business:

Jay Tontz, Dean of the School of Business and Economics, provided CAPR with some additional information about business school accreditation. Dean Tontz indicated that there are approximately 2000 business schools in the United States of which 17.8% are accredited by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business: The International Association for Management Education. CSUH is accredited by the AACSB.

Dean Tontz fielded a number of CAPR questions. The GMAT is required of our students in the overseas graduate programs while other universities do not require it. This is often due to the fact that other universities send interviewers over to the foreign country who interview each individual candidate. CSUH can not afford this at this time, therefore the GMAT is still required of our foreign graduate students. In addition, other state-side graduate business school programs do not
require the GMAT for entry and we do. This is largely due to the fact that our business school has not found anything else comparable to the GMAT upon which to gauge the knowledge of entering students. National enrollment in undergraduate business schools is dropping but many schools are realizing that there is tremendous opportunity to grow in graduate business school education. The telecommunications and computer information systems disciplines are seeing the largest growth in the number of classes offered and accounting is seeing the greatest decrease due to national trends and the fact that much of accounting is becoming computerized. New curricula are being developed to handle the shift in the labor force demand. AACSB criteria for accreditation is moving toward a process based on a school=s mission statement. The review of the undergraduate core is done. The undergraduate curriculum committee is identifying changes to be made to core courses and some rewriting of individual courses will be happening. Dean Tontz stressed that the BSBA is an interdisciplinary degree, it is less focused on a major and a small degree of specialized courses are taken by the students. Business ethics courses are taught in the business school. It has been difficult to recruit doctoral hires in computer information systems and accounting. One CIS Ph.D. has been hired and the Dean indicated that it was time to start looking for an accounting Ph.D. for the school.

Motion to accept the School of Business and Economics Five Year Review without modification to the program. M/S/P [Yea 9, No 0, Abstentions 0]

Sandy Heisey will write CAPR=s response to the review.

Dean Tontz also requested that the Department of Economics be reviewed by CAPR along with the School of Business and Economics and not as a separate program. CAPR will discuss this at a future meeting.

6. Revision of Five Year Program Review Process:

The Five Year Program Review Process subcommittee (Asoke Basu, Jane Lopus and Susan Opp) will meet on Wednesday October 27 and Chair Acord will join them.

CAPR proceeded to talk about many facets of the Five Year Program review process. It would be useful to confer with department chairs and Deans on the review process. The review should play a part in department planning. Perhaps the reviews for departments who prepare for national accreditation could some how be in synch with each other. The idea of having each program fill out a fact sheet on a quarterly or annual basis was brought up. CAPR members debated the nature of such a fact sheet. Some thought it was not a good idea to put too much emphasis on numbers and that more was needed on goals. It was noted that numbers must be put into context to be meaningful and that it=s not useful to compare apples to oranges. Such a fact sheet might be useful to compare our program to others in the CSU or nation. CAPR talked about the consistency between Five Year Reviews. It was noted that the more consistency CAPR asks for, the less meaningful the reports may become. It would be useful to CAPR if ExComm could give us examples of which CAPR reports from last year were Agood@ and which were less Agood@. The Five Year Review policy may want to address how the outside reviewer is selected. A program self-review might be useful to prepare for the outside reviewer so that the review has some information before coming to campus. The Provost indicated that any self-study should be based in objective reality. The Provost also indicated that many national associations have lists of people who are specifically noted as those who can be contacted for outside reviews. The Five Year Review policy might develop a procedure that doesn=t allow for loopholes which allow
programs to avoid putting in a review. What recourse does CAPR have for programs that do not submit reviews? Dr. Chu was asked for his view of the process at CSU Chico and he indicated that the reviews were very uneven there. He also indicated that any review is another piece of information in the folder upon which faculty and administration can act and that building any case for any action takes time. Outcomes assessments are becoming more important throughout the CSU, and it was generally thought that CAPR should think about how this can be folded into the review process.

Chair Acord asked that Michael Hedrick, Jose Lopez, Bijan Mashaw and Mary Timney speak with their respective Deans about the CAPR Five Year Program Review Process so that more information can be brought back to the subcommittee.

7. **Motion to Adjourn:** **M/S/P**
The meeting was adjourned at 3:51 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Laherty, Secretary