Present: Kim Geron, Political Science
   Jiansheng Guo, Human Development
   Jason Singley, Physics
   Linda Smetana, TED
   Aline Soules, Library, Chair
   Jay Tontz, CBE
   Margaret Wright, Nursing

   Colin Ormsby, Presidential Appointee

Apologies: Tony Lima, Economics
   Barbara Hall, Philosophy

Absent: Denise Wong, EOP

Guests: Carl Bellone, AVP for Graduate Studies & Academic Programming

Convened 2:06 pm

A G E N D A

   1. Approval of the Agenda

   Passed unanimously; moved Smetana, seconded Tontz

   2. Approval of the minutes of the meetings of April 17 and May 1, 2008

   April 17th minutes approved unanimously; moved Tontz, seconded Singley
   May 1st minutes approved unanimously; moved Tontz, seconded Smetana

   3. Report of the Chair

   The chair reported that she attended the Executive Committee and that the Chemistry
   Department’s review was put on the Senate agenda. She indicated that General
   Education will also be on the next senate meeting agenda.

   4. Report of the Presidential appointee

   None given
5. Old Business [NOTE: topics will be interspersed with the new reviews]

a. CAPR report for Kinesiology – status update

Smetana, liaison to KPE, indicated that a draft of the CAPR report for KPE would be out as soon as possible, hopefully today.

The chair advised members that they may have to reconvene on May 22\textsuperscript{nd} to clear the remaining (outstanding) department and CAPR reports.

b. CAPR report for Geography/Environmental Studies – status update

Via E-mail Lima informed the committee that he is working on the CAPR document for GES and hopes to have a draft by Monday, May 12, 2008.

c. CAPR report for Anthropology – status update

Wright indicated that a draft of the Anthropology report would be ready by the end of the day.

Modern Languages and Social Work were still outstanding and will not be addressed until later. The chair would like the committee to address these reports by e-mail so they do not have to carry the reports over to the next academic year.

6. New business

a. Confirmation of email vote for CBE discontinuance requests

This was confirmed via e-mail.

b. CAPR process recommendation report

Chair asked for feed back:

CAPR committee member Singley gave general notes: he suggested that the templates proposed by the committee by link on the CAPR webpage. He favored this as it was not technically hard to do and it would help the departments.

He also asked whether it was appropriate for the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Special Projects to be listed as the designated representative given his busy schedule.

AVP Bellone felt that someone from the University’s academic division should be represented at the meeting. He gave a short history of representation of the committee indicating that until recently there had always been a member of the academic division in
the CAPR committee. At times it had been the director of Institutional Research and Assessment (now the Office of Planning and Institutional Research and no longer a part of the University’s academic division), and in past years it had even been the provost.

After a brief discussion it was decided that the wording would be something along the lines of the AVP or his designate.

Committee members also recommended that departmental reports be submitted to the senate office in electronic versions as well as paper.

The committee then discussed the value of having either a Blackboard or SharePoint site dedicated to the posting of reports.

CAPR committee member Guo raised concerns about the shear volume of information submitted by departments for review. Smetana also commented on the increase in volume of information submitted by the departments especially since the introduction of CAPR 9.

Committee member Singley did feel, however, that the appendixes are useful even though they are not always referenced. He proposed that there should be a list of what has to be in the departmental reports as opposed to departments simply adding information the department deems valuable.

The majority of the committee liked the template and thought it would be useful. They also suggested that the committee may want to propose a certain length for the reports in order to give departments some guidance.

The committee discussed whether to make recommendations regarding the length of the reports.

The committee members also discussed a proposed preparation timeline for departments to follow. They suggested that the University offer greater clarification as to the expectations of the self-study. The committee discussed the WASC recommendation of hiring two outside reviewers as opposed to only one. A number of committee members indicated that they felt this would add both cost and administrative challenges with no specific benefit identified. The committee was comfortable with requiring one outside reviewer and having a second as an option.

The committee also thought it prudent to have departments start thinking about the five year review process beginning in the winter of the year prior to their review. They thought that the department should also identify and contact the person they wanted as their outside reviewer in the spring prior to the year of their review. The committee hopes that this may enable departments to reduce the administrative challenges of doing all the activities required of the review in the year they are trying to document their work.
The committee also suggested recommending to departments that they keep their oral presentations to 10 to 15 minutes. They indicated that some departments had taken more time than was necessary to profile their department therefore leaving less time to ask questions.

The chair asked for a vote on the document with the amendments suggested.

Passed unanimously; moved Tontz, seconded Smetana

7. Other business

8. Adjournment

Adjourned 3:52 pm

Minutes respectfully submitted by Colin Ormsby, Secretary.