Present: James Ahiakpor, Economics
Barbara Hall, Philosophy
Pat Jennings, Sociology
Michael Lee, Geography & Environmental Studies
Chung-Hsing Ouyang, Math and Computer Science
Aline Soules, Library, Chair
Margaret Wright, Nursing and health science

Apologies: Linda Smetana, TED
Colin Ormsby, Presidential Appointee

Guests: Valerie Helgren-Lempesis, TED
James Zarrillo, TED
Carl Bellone, Dean, Interdisciplinary Studies Program

AGENDA
Meeting called to order at 15:08
1) Approval of the Agenda
   a) Lee move to approve agenda, Second Chung-Hsing, passed
2) Approval of the minutes of April 02, 2009
   a) Chung-Hsing move, Jennings second, passed
3) Report of the Chair
   a) MOU for Social Work was held successfully, April 21, 2009
   b) This completes all MOUs for 2007-2008
4) Report of the Presidential appointee
   a) No report
5) Old business
   a) CAPR document changes
      i) There are still challenges with retention data and how to request it from programs. There is
         pressure from CSU and WASC to provide data on retention for majors, which is problematic
         for CSUEB
         (1) Many students change majors frequently; some majors have very high non-retention (e.g.,
             in the sciences); many do not declare a major until very late in the degree process.
             Programs, therefore, often add students to their majors lists in BlackBoard. As a result,
             the official record in PeopleSoft and BlackBoard’s list of majors do not coincide.
         (2) To address this issue, CSUEB needs to change its culture. Students require incentives to
             declare a major, although students have a right change majors as appropriate. Faculty
             and programs need to understand the differences in the data between PeopleSoft (official)
             and BlackBoard (unofficial, working lists of program majors).
         (3) WASC will need longitudinal data, however, when it returns for its next visit
             (a) Part of the issue with WASC is the requirements for evidence-based comments on
                 issues such as retention. CSUEB needS to be able to talk about why students aren’t
                 graduating, why they pursue their patterns of declaring, not declaring, and changing
                 majors).
         (4) Need centralized assessment in support of departments collecting assessments
         (5) This issue cannot be solved in time to submit the CAPR 9 proposed revisions, which need
             to be sent to ExCom by April 24. The issue of retention data will be placed on next
week’s agenda with the idea of sending this forward to ExCom as a separate item to be dealt with next year.

6) New business
   i) Department of Interdisciplinary Studies –
      (1) Dept intro: This program is not a regular program that advertises and seeks majors. It is a program that lets students design their own major based on students’ proposals. There is a committee of 3 faculty members from at least 2 different departments for each student. Programs are offered at both the Bachelor and Masters level. No faculty member is obligated to participate; it is entirely voluntary. The program has been running for a number of years, but there have been a few changes based on the last 5 year report. Concerns at that time were: 1) requirement for face to face advising 2) learning outcomes for department, and 3) a change in the name of the program to Interdisciplinary Studies from Special Majors. In addition, there is discussion about raising the GPA requirement to 2.5 from 2.3. Undergrad is 2.3 and many other similar programs require 2.5, suggest moving to 2.5. The number of majors in this program is slightly lower than in the past, but it is not statistically significant in light of the low numbers to begin with. Fewer is not necessarily bad as this creates extra work for faculty with high intensity requirements.

      (a) A survey of faculty revealed that 60% conduct face-to-face meetings where all three advisors and the student meet at same time. There are no concerns raised by students about this matter and few by faculty. If this is made an absolute requirement, it could delay graduation from the program. At the moment, this is not a requirement, but a request. With more electronic communication, this seems reasonable.

      (b) The program now requires learning outcomes as part of the student proposal; three-quarters of the faculty thought the SLO was useful, but only 40% used it at the end of a student’s program. As a result, this is now a requirement for faculty to the SLO to assess students at the end of the program.

      (c) The program used to conduct an exit survey, which was linked with graduation checks, but when the graduation checks went online, the survey got de-linked. The program has now found a way to change this. The program has used focus groups as a substitute, and the groups have been positive about the program. As for a faculty survey, the program has found that email and phone contacts work fine, and faculty is generally positive about the program. There has been an expressed concern about not understanding the whole process, so the program has updated the forms for faculty to link to the program requirements. The faculty who answered the survey all support continuation of the program.

      (d) Next 5 year plan: There will be a new requirement and form for assessing SLOs prior to graduation, and new marketing to faculty/advisors about its availability. They plan to clear up the description for the program and the steps for faculty. They will go back to exit surveys. They will send individual letters to faculty who participate as a way to acknowledge its contributions. Potentially, they will increase the undergraduate GPA to 2.5. The program did not agree with one recommendation from the outside reviewer. He expressed some concern that the Dean/Associate Dean is a rubber stamp for the student proposal and suggested yet another committee; however, the program already has many review steps prior to the approval by the Dean/Associate Dean (especially as faculty have already reviewed the student proposal twice and they are the specialists in the field). The administrators are simply reviewing the proposal to see that there is no duplication with existing programs or a lack of campus resources.

(2) Liaison Chung-Hsing Question –
   (a) Praise to the department for energy and enthusiasm for students. Is there clear guidance for the Chair’s responsibility in the program? Each committee has a faculty chair for the students. Also, there is the Chair of the Home Department for the student. The program has been working on redesigning and increasing faculty orientation to clear up the roles and responsibilities of the different areas of the committee.
(b) Is there a special arrangement with faculty? If a student has no or little idea about which faculty to involve, then the program provides some suggestions. Many come in with the faculty they want on the committee, but there is no obligation on those faculty members to say yes. The program also reviews whether faculty expertise lines up with the student proposal and may advise the student that another faculty member would be better.

(c) Question about networking within the student cohort and whether scholarships are available to them. The students don’t have access to individual department scholarships (which are few). Networking is different than is the case with regular majors. The program is very focused on self-directed students who have chosen this path.

(3) Other CAPR questions

(a) With your retirement (Carl), do you have any idea what is going to happen are far as managing this program?

(i) Many programs house their interdisciplinary studies in the Academic AVP’s Office, as those persons have the responsibility for interdisciplinary and university-wide academic programs. This is a function of those offices.

(ii) Faculty has to sign-off for each student, and generally across colleges, which addresses concerns about “administrative” vs. “faculty” supervision of the program.

(b) There is a statement by the outside reviewer that the work of faculty is essentially pro-bono. The student enrolls in classes, but the student doesn’t count in the major and the department is not given advising credit. Though this contribution can be included in PRT for faculty, it would be good for the department to get their portion of the credit for that student.

(i) It might be possible to proportion out the majors to the departments involved.

(ii) There could be a report about the departments and faculty involved each year in interdisciplinary studies

(ii) It was suggested that perhaps some credit in the form of assigned time could be given to faculty, as the work does take a lot of time, especially for advising.

(c) Assessment is discussed in the outsider reviewer’s report. There is an overarching goal for the program (the student must approach a problem from at least two different disciplines). Could this be assessed and are the individual SLOs being tracked?

(i) It hasn’t been the Committee Chair/committee’s responsibility to assess individual SLOs. This was recommended and will be required in future. This could then be expanded to a meta-analysis process.

(d) With respect to the outside reviewer’s suggestion about advertising, working through faculty would allow faculty to channel students who just don’t fit standard degrees into this program.

ii) New option in Early Childhood Education in TED

(1) Motion to approve – Lee, Seconded Chung-Hsing

(2) The rationale for program: there is considerable interest among policy-makers for a higher degree of preparation and education for preschool teachers. The first Five Commission (CA initiatives for 0-5 years olds) have pushed for MS degrees. CCC and Alameda First Five are very supportive, including funding an advisor and scholarships for up to 23 students and also providing book stipends. Currently at Concord campus, CCC First Five is funding 19 students for MS in curriculum, and really advocating for students to learn methods and curriculum development. They are already in leadership roles (on local and state commissions). By the year 2010, Headstart aims to have 40% of all teachers with a BA/BS, and increasing that in future years until all have a Bachelor degree.

(a) Question: There are 2 new courses under “required,” but the 4000 level courses listed are not in the catalog. Is that a resource issue? The courses are already in place, but relatively new and not listed in the catalog yet. The only issue would be the 7 units for 2010/11 and the program would simply reduce electives. The
program already has multiple Kindergarten teachers interested in courses, because of articulation issues.

(3) Passed, no opposed.

iii) Request from CSD (Department of Communication Science and Disorders)
   (1) Motion to approve – Lee, Second Jennings
   (2) Change the pattern of 5 year review, The program is dealing with a major curriculum revision related to accreditation to be submitted in Fall 2011/2012.
   (3) It was suggested that they be monitored annually until the next 5 year review as there are a number of intervening years. This will be done through their annual reports.
   (4) Their next five year review will therefore be in 2012/2013 after their accreditation is complete (which is the CAPR 9 requirement)
   (5) Passed with the stipulation that progress be noted in annual reports until the next 5 year cycle in 2012/2013

7) CAPR reports
   a) Art
      i) Motion to accept draft report Lee, Second Jennings
      ii) Approved, no opposition
   b) Business (CBE)
      i) Motion to accept draft report Lee, Second Ahiakpor
      ii) Friendly amendments : reconcile the number of new hires who have resigned (pg2 and pg4); Sec1.1 3rd paragraph implies that lecturers don’t meet quality, but ASBE wants TT not lecturers; typo on pg 5, 4.1; pg 6 increase of faculty TT ratio needs to be fixed.
      iii) Approved with amendments. No opposition
   c) Recreation
      i) Motion to accept the draft Soules, Second Jennings
      ii) Reword recommendations and strengthen by noting CAPR support.
      iii) Approved with amendments. No opposition.

8) CAPR documents update
   a) Need to decide about data needs
   b) Continuation of discussion about WASC requirements regarding reporting retention by major and ethnicity
      i) Department goal is to attract majors and keep majors; university also wants to know about majors attracted from other programs; concern regarding departments being “dinged” in cases where majors move a great deal. Retention data need to be included only if numbers help departments in planning. Possible configurations:
         (1) started in program – graduated in program (retention)
         (2) started in other program – graduated in program (attracted and retained)
         (3) by first time freshman and by transfers
      ii) suggest sending forward without retention data, and in separate letter suggest that CAPR and appropriate faculty and administrators deal with the retention data issue next year — agreed
      iii) Other changes to the data in the proposed revisions: remove part-time TT, as there are none; CRS on page 3 is short for courses; need to add graduate courses to the courses list; correct spelling of headcount
   c) Motion to approve final package of CAPR documents changes Hall, Seconded Chung-Hsing
   d) Approved, will go forward tomorrow to Excomm

9) Adjournment
   a) Moved Lee, Seconded Hall, adjourned at 15:49

Next meeting April 30, Multimedia; will also continue data discussion next week.