Minutes of the Meeting of February 5, 2004

Members Present: Judy Clarence, Jiansheng Guo, Chris Lubwama, Vish Hegde, Juan Robles, Gloria M. Rodriguez, Michael Strait (Chair), Gale Young (Representative for Presidential Appointee)

Members Absent: Kevin Callahan, Susan Gubernat, Janet Patterson

Chair Strait called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m. and welcomed College of Science representative Juan Robles (Nursing and Health Sciences Dept.) who will replace Helen Zong during Winter Quarter.

1. Approval of the Agenda
   The agenda was approved with the addition of Program Review Schedule Updates (new item 5). Lubwama requested that we discuss the inclusion of the Taxation program as part of the review of Business Administration. Motion to approve agenda, amendments. M/S/P

2. Approval of Minutes of January 15, 2004
   The Minutes were approved as submitted.

3. Report of the Chair
   Strait has not yet prepared the memo inviting the persons involved in the proposal recommending the discontinuance of the Arts Administration program to a future CAPR meeting. He plans send CAPR members a draft of the memo, including suggested questions to pose to the guests, by the end of the week. Lubwama noted the agenda item concerning the proposed discontinuance of the Operations and Research program and suggested that it be included in the discussions.

   Strait spoke earlier with Art Dept. chair Michael Hennessey about review planning, but did not realize that Art is listed as an outside-reviewed program. In further discussion Hennessey explained that the faculty have decided to discontinue external accreditation and want to resume regular CAPR reviews. They have already found an outside reviewer, approved by the Dean.

   Strait received an email from Anthropology Dept. Chair Laurie Price, wondering what sort of follow-up takes place after a review. Strait noted that there is no formal procedure or practice, and that usually the only meaningful
discussion of a program review takes place in Ex Com. He observed that there ought to be a way to make reviews and outcomes assessments more influential in tenure-track resource allocation decisions. Most other CSU campuses hold meetings among the Dean, Provost, and the Department Chair, to discuss the review process—and those meetings often result in action items. Lubwama noted that, as a committee of the Academic Senate, our reviews should be considered an official expression of the faculty. Guo pointed to CAPR-7, which says it’s incumbent on a department to use its review in a meaningful way for resource allocation. Lubwama observed that chairs and deans get copies of our minutes, so they’re able to see the results of our reviews. According to Young, WASC may well observe that, as a campus, we generally ignore reviews. Good minds go into the preparation, but these reviews are not well utilized. Hegde suggested that CAPR’s role should be better defined. Strait agreed, and felt that greater clarification of CAPR’s role might emerge eventually, but—in light of the creation of COBRA—not anytime soon. He’s heard that COBRA is trying hard to understand the budget, and will remain engrossed in that steep learning curve for most of this academic year. Some fine points of the roles of committees after last year’s Senate bylaws changes are still under discussion in the Faculty Affairs Committee. Strait further thinks that CAPR’s role is to help departments make the strongest possible cases for their needs, whereas COBRA is more involved in the process of determining the actual allocations.

Strait received an email from Telecommunication Systems asking if our acceptance of their request to delay review until next year is the final word, or if the request has to go through Ex Com. Strait replied that CAPR is the final authority, but we do need to document requests for postponement.

4. **Report of the Presidential Appointee**

Young will meet with Stan Clark next week to discuss her continuance as the representative of the Presidential Appointee (Provost Martino), in light of the Provost’s recent retirement. She also announced that the campus has made a formal offer to a candidate for Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Assessment, and the candidate has informally accepted. Strait noted that this new hire represents an important opportunity for us to be able to better define and retrieve the statistical data for programs and departments. Young stressed the importance of the academic review process to WASC. They will look closely at our assessments of degree programs and will note any lack of alignments between the process and the allocation of resources. Departments and programs benefit greatly from the periods of reflection and self-study the review process affords, but too frequently all the efforts are lost in the allocation processes.

5. **Program Review Schedule updates**

The document *Academic plan 2004-2005 through 2008-200*, which lists the schedule of reviews for degree programs, was examined. It was noted that is a list of degree-granting programs, not of academic departments. Thus a department with a group of degree programs, such as Business Administration, is reviewed as
one entity. Clarence questioned the effectiveness of this approach, citing the example of the department of the Department of Modern Languages. Only Spanish and French (which confer degrees) come up for review, which means that offerings such as Japanese, Tagalog, or Sign Language escape review altogether. Guo reflected that this practice disturbs the student faculty ratio and raises other problems. Strait agreed that the situation is complex; we often act as if the chief priority is to preserve the department rather than to strengthen the academic programs, and he feels it should be other way around. Young spoke of the integrity of the degree vs. the integrity of the department as an administrative unit. Guo advised that the department, as a unit, should be the item under review. First we need justify existence of a program, then look at the department as a whole. Strait suggested that programs managed by a single department should continue to be reviewed as an entity, but that service programs such as the GE program, which is comprised of several departments, should be the exception.

Lubwama insisted that the MS in Taxation should be not be listed in this document as an entity separate from Business Administration because the program is externally reviewed right along with Business Administration. Strait noted that the list is by degree program, and we do offer a Masters in taxation. He suggested that this situation is analogous to that of Modern Languages in which Spanish and French are listed separately. Lubwama emphasized that the separation of Taxation is a mistake because the two areas will be accredited together and Taxation is part of Accounting. Strait replied that we can’t remove Taxation from the list without authorization. Lubwama replied that the Dean has already written a letter, of which Lubwama has a copy, asking Taxation to be taken off the list, but it still appears. Strait will investigate further.

The group agreed to recommend that Carl Bellone remove the underscore (which indicates outside review) from the Art listing, and remove Taxation from the list. Clarence questioned the fact that Mass Communication and Speech Communication are still listed separately although the programs are now combined. Strait responded that, until the paperwork is completed in the Chancellor’s office, the two degrees are still separate.

6. Discontinuance of Operations and Research Options (in Business Administration)

Lubwama explained that the Dean feels this option should be discontinued because there are only one or two students enrolled. Guo wondered if we should be as concerned about elimination of an “option” as we are about a degree program such as Arts Administration. He further suggested that because Operations and Research does not have the status of a stand-alone degree, CAPR doesn’t need to be involved in its discontinuance. Lubwama responded that actually CAPR no longer should have a say in the feasibility of a program or an option; we should only address issues of quality. Some schools have a minimum number of credit hours that define an option as an entity to be reviewed by a program review body such as CAPR. Strait will investigate further.
7. Work Group Updates

Strait had planned to demonstrate the Blackboard site for CAPR work group communications, but technical difficulties interceded. He encouraged members to use the CAPR Blackboard Organization facility, which he has set up for self-enrollment. Not everyone has enrolled—he’ll send out instructions again, via email. An email notification feature allows members to be notified when a document is posted or messages or responses arrive. Several documents are already posted. Strait advised that anyone who wants to be kept informed of the work of any of the groups should log into that group even if they’re not an official member. Lubwama suggested that the Academic Standards document should appear on the site.

8. Other Business

CAPR looked at portions of the 12/9/03 Memorandum of Executive Vice Chancellor David Spense to Members of the CSU Academic Council with the subject line Annual Reports for Inclusion in Board of Trustees Agenda Item on Academic Planning and Program Review. CAPR is particularly concerned with items 1) and 2) on the first page, which require that each campus provide a summary of the results of assessment of student learning outcomes and a summary of changes in program requirements. Strait suggested that CAPR require an abstract to address this document. Ideally, program review documents would be available online, with abstracts which could be pulled out and assembled into a single summary. Guo wondered what the departments actually need to report. Strait responded that they need to submit a plan of action which includes a documentation of the results of the review, and a report of faculty deliberations concerning those results. Young remarked that two or three years ago she and Strait put together a somewhat controversial draft of a student-oriented university-wide outcomes assessment which was to be tried out on ALSS. Nothing much has come of it. Lubwama observed that the College of Business has its own outcomes assessment office.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Clarence, Secretary