COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW

Present:
Jiansheng Guo, Human Development; Barbara Hall, Philosophy; Tony Lima, Economics; Jason Singley, Physics; Linda Smetana, TED; Aline Soules, Library, Chair; Jay Tontz, CBE; Margaret Wright, Nursing; Colin Ormsby, Presidential Appointee

Apologies: Kim Geron, Political Science

Absent: Denise Wong, EOP

Guests: Rita Liberti, Kinesiology
        Jodi Servatius, Dean, CEAS

Meeting convened at 2:10 pm.

1. Approval of the Agenda

Approved unanimously, moved Tontz; second Smetana

Amendment/clarification to the KPE review:
  • Athletics will not be addressed as a part of the KPE review. Liberti will speak to this matter during the review.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of April 3, 2008

Approved unanimously, moved Smetana, second Lima

3. Report of the Chair

No report given

4. Report of the Presidential appointee

No report given

5. Old Business

a. CAPR report for General Education – status update
The chair of CAPR announced the General Education review had been passed on to Executive Committee.

b. CAPR report for Chemistry – progress report

CAPR report on the Chemistry department’s review has been submitted by Singley. The Chemistry department chair did think that the Chemistry needed greater staffing than they originally argued. They thought that they should have two full time staff members to work with students. The department has doubled the number of students and felt that doubling the number staff was in order (committee members suggested it be discussed with Armando Gonzalez).

Motion to approve with corrections passed unanimously, moved Lima, second Hall

c. Update on Scheduling 2007-2008 reviews

April 3: Chemistry (meeting complete)
April 17: Kinesiology, 3 p.m.
May 1: Geography/Environmental studies, 2 p.m.; Anthropology, 3 p.m.
May 15: Spanish/French, 2 p.m.; Social Work, 3 p.m.
Pub Admin – deferred – materials due Oct. 15
Recreation – deferment request received

d. Update on status of Annual Reports

There are a number of outstanding annual reports and the chair of CAPR will send out another gentle reminder to those departments that have not yet submitted their reports.

The question was raised as to the purpose of the annual report. The chair explained that it is an opportunity for CAPR to review additional items, updates, and progress on recommendations in the five year reviews.

e. World travel certificate budget

The Executive Committee asked the Chair of Modern Languages to send CAPR a revised proposal with a budget. The chair of CAPR asked for reactions to the proposed budget, which would include either student participant fees or instructional funds.

After discussion the committee concluded that the program had submitted what was requested (a budget).

Motion to approve, with adaptation of the budget to reference the standard campus per diem for faculty.

Passed unanimously with adaptation, moved Singley, second Tontz
f. Recreation deferment request

Recreation requested a deferment as they are in the process of applying for National Parks and Recreation accreditation.

The department requested that it submit its report by the end of the winter of 2009.

The committee asked for a status report on review activities by January 15, 2009 and the submission of full documentation by March 1, 2009. This will not change their five year rotation unless it is connected to its new accreditation cycle. The committee will entertain that request, as appropriate.

For clarification, the chair pointed out that the department consists of two areas, recreation and hospitality, each of which offers two programs.

g. CAPR 9

Suggestions regarding updating both reporting and CAPR 9 programming will be made to the Faculty Senate Office by the Chair of CAPR 9 prior to the year-end deadline.

The committee also discussed other and perhaps better ways to make the outline for the CAPR 9 review easier for programs to complete. This might include a concise outline that would be easy for programs to follow.

Additionally, some members of the committee suggested that the department provide some examples of CAPR 9 review reports so they understand more clearly what CAPR 9 requires. The committee discussed whether the availability of a physical copy might discourage departments from using the web, which is where they should go for documentation.

6. New Business

a. Kinesiology five year program review (time certain 3 p.m.)

2:52 pm Rita Liberti & Jodi Servatius joined the meeting.

Liberti commented that she felt that the review process was helpful and she was pleased to report that the department faculty became very involved in the process.

Assessment

Liberti raised some concerns about assessment. She felt that they were not yet where they as a department wished to be although they are addressing the issue of assessment. The department is hoping that they will get greater faculty buy in. There is not uniform buy in at this time within the department. However, the department has a number of new faculty members and she thinks that there is more buy in as a result.
Department Growth

Kinesiology now has 300 students, 100 more than they had in 2000. The post-baccalaureate complicates their student calculation as they are not traditional undergraduate students. Liberti voiced concern that this would affect their counts for the Chancellor’s Office.

Cross-Department Course Offerings

Liberti reported that the department conducts upper division courses in education, social sciences, and sciences. It is the only department on campus to provide such a wide array of courses to so many schools.

Liberti offered special thanks to the leadership of the interim dean of CEAS, Jodi Servatius, who has lent her support.

The chair of CAPR asked the chair of Kinesiology to list the department’s strengths and challenges:

Strengths

- Two new tenure track faculty which will bring the number of tenure track faculty in the department back up to 9.
- The department at CSUEB offers the broadest core in the CSU for KPE.
- The department has higher energy in the department with new faculty and greater resources and leadership with the new energy on the campus in general.
- Facilities and the reworking of the gym have really made a difference. Further, the Kinesiology lab has been greatly improved and continues to be improved. The department worked with Sonoma State to sell the old campus bod-pod, which will be replaced with a new, gold standard bod-pod. This will not only provide the campus community with an improved piece of equipment, but allow the department to reach out to the community.

Challenges

- Lack of support from the University makes Kinesiology faculty feel that they are on thin ice. Perception is a part of that, but a larger issue is that the University does not appear to have planned for equipment. (This mirrors the chemistry problem mentioned at the last meeting). The department relies heavily on their facilities. The department space is very old, but it is an open space and that could permit a reorganization of the existing space in a renovation. More classroom space is also needed.
- The issue of Athletics raises concerns. Athletics are not a part of the KPE program. The University as a community tends to have some difficulty making this distinction. This is complicated by the fact that coaches, for the most past,
are in Unit 3 and also faculty in KPE. There are a number of issues related to the current discussion about moving Athletics in or out of the department. This is compounded by the potential move of the University to Division II, an issue that was not discussed with KPE at the time the discussion began. At this time, the outcome of these two issues is unknown. CAPR suggested that they address the evolution of these issues each year in the program’s annual report.

Liberti pointed out that it is difficult to have coaches nested within KPE for other reasons. It causes recruitment problems and also faculty count issues.

A CAPR committee member inquired about the needs of the department based on the core courses they need to teach, and asked why they did not request a tenure-track line to deal with buy out time for the chair. The chair of the department responded that because they are interdisciplinary and cover a number of areas across education, social sciences, and sciences, it is unlikely they could make a single hire that would be able to teach in all those areas.

Liberti pointed out that there are ways to address some of their faculty needs. An example is a set of activity classes that can be taught by non-tenure track faculty. Also, coaches have expertise that cannot be tapped when their time is so heavily devoted to teaching PE classes. The overall savings could be in excess of $150,000.00. The program thinks that without growth, 9 to 10 full time faculty would be a reasonable number, but with any growth, which they anticipate, the program will require two more people almost immediately.

A CAPR committee member asked why the department did not get rid of the pre-athletic training option.

The chair of KPE explained that even though CSUEB’s pre-athletic training program is not accredited, they get a number of students who want to go on to a Master’s program in athletic training. This may change when San Jose and Sacramento start BA programs in the local area.

A CAPR committee member asked why the department does not recruit at high schools as well as community colleges.

Coaches are good recruiters and perhaps having them go out to high schools would be a viable option.

A CAPR committee member raised concerns about funding (page 34 of the report).

The chair explained that the Athletics and KPE budgets are kept separate; however, the department is concerned that the money generated by DCIE may be in jeopardy when the new student wellness center is opened. The department is not allowed to use that facility because it supported by student fees and cannot be used for instructional purposes. At the
moment, funds generated through DCIE are used to maintain equipment used by the
program. They wish to retain their rights over the DCIE funding already accumulated.

The CAPR chair asked the chair of KPE what two or three things she would stress as a
result of the review.

The KPE chair mentioned the following:

1. Being thoughtful about the athletic issue, not doing it in a haphazard way;
2. Paying attention to facilities and space issues; and
3. Pursuing the need for tenure track faculty.

Dean Servatius was very complementary of CAPR’s thoughtful work and thanked the
committee for its time.

7. Adjournment

Adjournment 3:58