CAPR Meeting Minutes, Thursday, April 16, 2009, 2:00 – 4:00 P.M

Present: James Ahiakpor, Economics
Barbara Hall, Philosophy
Pat Jennings, Sociology
Michael Lee, Geography & Environmental Studies
Colin Ormsby, Presidential Appointee
Chung-Hsing Ouyang, Math and Computer Science
Linda Smetana, TED
Aline Soules, Library, Chair
Margaret Wright, Nursing and Health Science

Apologies: Pat Zajac, Chair, Criminal Justice
Keith Inman, Criminal Justice
Dawna Komorosky, Criminal Justice
Julie Beck, Criminal Justice
Silvina Ituarte, Criminal Justice
Jong Jun, Public Affairs and Administration
Jim Okutsu, Associate Dean, CLASS
Carl Bellone, Associate Vice President for Academic Programs & Graduate Studies

Guests: Pat Zajac, Chair, Criminal Justice
Keith Inman, Criminal Justice
Dawna Komorosky, Criminal Justice
Julie Beck, Criminal Justice
Silvina Ituarte, Criminal Justice
Jong Jun, Public Affairs and Administration
Jim Okutsu, Associate Dean, CLASS
Carl Bellone, Associate Vice President for Academic Programs & Graduate Studies

A G E N D A

Meeting called to order at 15:08

1) Approval of the Agenda
   a) Chung-Hsing move to approve agenda, Second Jennings, passed

2) Approval of the minutes of April 02, 2009
   a) Smetana move, Jennings second, passed
   b) Changes in grammar amendments given to Aline

3) Report of the Chair
   a) 4 annual reports are in of about 44, were due March 22, 2009. Aline will send out and email.
      Sue Opp has been informed about this issue.
   b) MOU for Social Work is 04/21/09
   c) Documents for proposed revisions were sent out yesterday

4) Report of the Presidential appointee
   a) No report

5) Old business
   a) CAPR document changes
   i) There is still a snag with the data. The CSU and WASC want data on retention on majors, which is problem
      (1) Many students change majors frequently, some majors have high non-retention, and many students do not declare majors until the last moment. The official record in PeopleSoft and BB list of majors are therefore not providing the same numbers.
(2) This may not be the time to require this data in five-year reviews; however, there is a need to change the culture so that students want to declare a major. Students, however, have the right to change majors.

(3) When WASC returns to campus, CSUEB will need the longitudinal data

(a) Part of the issue with WASC is that we need to provide evidence-based responses, and we need to be able to talk about why students aren’t graduating or are changing majors

(4) Need centralized assessment in support of departments collecting assessments

(5) It was decided to request retention data in the self-study as a catalyst to change the culture. The department can deal with and analyze the data.

(a) This issue could be raised separately from the proposed revisions in order to start a discussion

(6) Proposed revisions need to go forward by April 24

6) New business

a) Department of Criminal Justice

i) Dept intro: CJ is a growing department with limited faculty. They want to take an ambitious look at the future, but a lot depends on financial constraints

(1) Liaison Hall Question – talk a bit more about the forensic science option which resides in chem. and bio, while advising is done by Criminal Justice

(a) Working on developing a forensic science major over multiple years. Due to problems with too many units for a major and the restrictions of special majors units, it was suggested that students get a bio or chem. degrees with a forensic science option. This included the creation of a new course by chem. Criminal justice does the advising so that students can enter the profession.

(b) Why can’t it be a criminal justice major?

(i) Because the crime labs typically want degrees in natural sciences (minimal qualification is typically a hard science degree). It is very common for forensics to be in science departments.

(c) Because of the science needs, the department would require too many units to make forensic science a criminal justice degree option

(d) There are many different arrangements to deal with criminal justice and forensic science and sciences

(e) One problem is that the options don’t have to declare until graduation, which causes problems in advising and being able to serve them. They have considered forming a forensic science club and encouraging students to declare during classes.

(f) Have a good working relationship with bio/chem., have even been using their labs for teaching

(2) Discuss more about the problems in putting together learning outcomes and assessment mechanisms

(a) The problems are mostly time and a lack of expertise in learning outcomes assessment. They have had trouble finding support for this on the campus, although PIR has helped. Within the faculty, they have created online tests, and some assessment has been completed, e.g., the critical thinking rubric, although the results have not been analyzed because of time shortages

(3) Student advisement and number of majors, discussion about impact status

(a) Recent approach from admin about impact status, exploring it, very early stages

(b) Ratio of majors to faculty numbers is a big issue

(c) Student advisement and course substitutions, how is that being dealt with? Does offering substitutions compromise the integrity of the degree?

(d) Yes and no, faculty usually look at the substitution very critically. It is not a good idea to delay graduation because of the lack of course offerings.

(e) Advising: there are lots of emails about required courses and electives. The problem is back to the issue of who declares, because only known majors can get emails directed specifically to the list of majors

(f) Considering adding group advising in Fall, with a road map for students
(g) Historically, they offered independent studies to help students graduate when needed courses weren’t offered, but they aren’t doing that anymore, due to the labor intensive nature of independent studies.

(4) One of their goals is to increase the number of majors. Given the number of faculty, is this feasible?
   (a) TT positions are based on growing the student population
   (b) Ideally, they want to grow and get more TT faculty and add an MS degree, but this is not immediately feasible

(5) Rank needs in priority order
   (a) New faculty – especially to develop an MS program

(6) Contributions to University, any more specifics?
   (a) Faculty have been involved in many University committees, Frosh clusters, Faculty Learning Communities, GE courses
   (b) Building this up might help in discussing needs with the administration

(7) Do you have any data about the claim of how ‘interesting’ the major is?
   (a) Having evidence for this claim could help with discussions about resource needs
   (b) CJ is talking about how to accommodate the Coast Guard and the military, who are coming back/leaving service. The criminal justice major is attractive to that cohort.
   (c) The university has a full-time staff person dedicated to veterans. They are also working on increasing acceptance of CLEP tests and Military credits. In general, veterans are interested in online courses/non-on campus classes. They have considered that there are some issues with impact status.

(8) Other CAPR questions – holding off on MS/MA program until new hires?
   (a) An MA program was proposed, but did not get authorized by the Chancellors Office.
   (b) They have new ideas and suggestions to work on, but it will be tough with only five faculty
   (c) UC, Davis offers an MA in forensic science through their extension division and it is always full. The Bay area has 7 crime labs with 2-300 analysts, few of whom have masters’ degrees. This leads CJ to believe that CSUEB would be fully enrolled if they were able to offer the program.

(9) Standards for MA in forensic science
   (a) Standards do exist and are not particularly rigorous, but having them formally authorized would be a draw and a place to start
   (b) CJ talked about offering a certification course for undergrads to help them gain the necessary certifications in this sub-field.
   (c) In a recent national report, it was recommended that all analysts be certified, so having a course related to that certification (even in an online program) would be a huge draw

(10) Outside reviewer seems to say program has issue with developing an identity and a sense of where it is going
   (a) They have lots of ideas and plans, but are limited by faculty size and all the “must do” tasks. As a result, they aren’t able to carry through on their ideas. They are in survival mode. At this point, they are beginning to see stability in the TT faculty. Now, they are doing a lot of little things in classes rather than tackling the big issues/ideas.
   (b) They are working on establishing an internship program for summer
   (c) They are working with the New York Innocence group to develop a course where forensic science students would review the science of specific cases
   (d) Suggestion – Maybe they just need to pick one thing and focus on it
   (e) Suggestion – Perhaps they could embed a baseline assessment within a course and then complete an assessment at end of the course. If that worked, they could scale the process to other courses.
      (i) Their need for comprehensive assessment within the major could be part of the discussion about resource needs
      (ii) They talked about adding a writing course to the major, as that is an area where students can fail to be hired.
(iii) Ultimately, assessment must be based on their stated outcomes for the degree.

(11) Question from CJ – Is CSUEB as supportive of departments as they are of faculty?
(a) It seems that departments do best in getting support if they have a strong idea about where they want/need to go and can prove that the program is already moving in that direction.

(12) 3 critical desires of program
(a) TT faculty
(b) Space, including a lab and a departmental office
(c) A budget to cover travel money, particularly for those faculty still seeking tenure.

(13) Process question from Program – CAPR will draft and approve a report to send to ExCom. ExCom will send it forward to the Senate for approval. After that, the provost calls an MOU meeting that includes the provost, the AVP for Academic Programs & Graduate Studies, the CAPR chair, the program chair, and the dean. The MOU is then written up by the provost in consultation with the dean.

(14) If CJ wishes, they can send additional information to the Senate Office as a supplement to their materials (electronic and 2 print copies).

b) Public Affairs Administration
i) Program Introduction
(1) MPA program was denied accreditation last year. This has lead to much reworking and focus on the problems that led to the accreditation issues. They have been able to look at the five-year review and the accreditation self-study jointly. At a faculty retreat, they looked at the department accreditation, SLOs and program mission. The five-year review largely addresses the issues raised by the accreditation process. There were issues in 4 areas: assessment; curriculum revision particularly related to information systems; lowered entry standards, which were implemented to increase the number of majors but ultimately lowered the quality of the student body (they have since raised the standards back to previous levels); and a lack of student advising. The National Association is introducing new standards next year. As a result, although they have completed work on their curriculum, the requirements may change. The CAPR review, however, has laid the groundwork for improvement, especially as related to the SLOs and their focus on their capstone class.

(2) Curriculum review: They consolidated the existing 5 options to 2. These were approved by the College committee and are going forward. This was done partly at the instigation of the outside reviewer, who thought that there were too many potions. They have also added a Foundation course in information management and dropped the statistics requirement.

ii) Liaison Ormsby questions –
(1) Particularly around assessment, how do you map to University-wide goals, how are they measured, how are you retaining information over time, and how will you cycle that information back to faculty to be used in the development and improvement of your courses and program?
(a) They have focused assessment on their capstone course (as suggested by the outsider reviewer) and are making SLOs shorter and more concise (again based on the suggestion of the outside reviewer). This started in winter quarter.
(b) SLO will be focused on core courses. Each year, they will add one more to the assessment process.
(c) Results will be reported to the faculty at quarterly faculty meetings and will be incorporated into courses and requirements at that time.
(d) Each course is developing rubrics for SLO assessment.

(2) It was suggested by CAPR that any items that follow students through the program, e.g., portfolios, would help students determine areas they need to strengthen (in addition to grades)
(a) This suggestion was well received
(b) Right now, however, the program is focused on the capstone course.
Another suggestion was that the program might want to assess something early in the cycle so that students would know what to focus on, and faculty would be alerted to possible concerns
(a) Currently, the program assesses basic data and writing skills at entry
(i) This suggestion could become an action plan for students at a lower level of writing capability
(b) After students finish Foundation courses, their performance is reviewed before they can continue
(i) Suggestion – as a way of preparing students to advance, there might be a course focused on helping them pass
(c) The capstone course with its assessment determines if the students have attained the necessary level of preparation and capability

There have been a lot of changes in the program. Does the department and college have a plan to sustain the changes, as implemented or suggested?
(a) They are working on team development among the faculty, so that they can work on issues together
(b) A bridge has been developed and faculty has started to work on issues
(c) They are in the process of recruiting a new chair

How realistic is it go back for accreditation, given implementation needs for the 5 year plan as developed? And is there a capacity to complete accreditation and a 5 year plan?
(a) It may be wise to wait until next year for accreditation, given their need to collect data from the SLOs and to re-examine the new standards coming from the National Association. At that point, they think they will be ready.

How is recruitment for the chair going?
1) They have a good pool. There are no internal candidates, which was advocated by the University
2) The external reviewer has been helpful and served as a consultant for the whole process. The department is moving forward with the consultant’s suggestions

How does a lack of accreditation affect the students in terms of how their degree is accepted?
1) A national survey of employers indicates that many employers (85%) don’t pay attention to accreditation
2) Students, however, consider it very important
3) WASC accredits the University and that is more important
4) Accreditation for the MPA is added value and not mandated by the profession. Many programs do not carry the accreditation.

Follow-up – why struggle so much to get the accreditation?
1) It is partly professional pride and partly related to the history of being the first accredited program. The loss of accreditation became news in the profession and others wondered what was happening at CSUEB. Also, enrollment is down this year because accreditation is seen as very important by the students

CBE and Recreation CAPR reports are out for vote
   a) Art should be out tonight

Adjournment
   a) Moved Jennings, Seconded Lee, adjourned at 15:58

Next meeting April 23, Interdisciplinary Studies is next week.