CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING & REVIEW

Approved Minutes of the CAPR Meeting, Thursday, February 18, 2010

Absent: Don Gailey, Colin Ormsby
Guest(s): Jeanette Bicais, Gale Young

1. Approval of the Agenda

M/S/P (Ahiakpor/Jennings).

2. Approval of the prior minutes 01-07-2010

M/S/P (Jennings/Ouyang).

3. Report of the Chair

Last senate meeting – all CAPR recommendations accepted without discussion and by unanimous vote.

Last Excomm meeting was cancelled. At previous meeting was discussion over the issue of CEAS Master’s programs five-year reviews and their desire to hold-off submission of their full documentation until next year, when the furlough program will no longer be in effect. Excomm felt that, given the wording of the action passed by the Academic Senate, those programs with their external accreditation reviews being completed this year were obliged to submit their review whereas he was operating under the assumption, based on our discussions at CAPR, that all programs should be eligible to delay their review one year, including those with outside accreditation – but that we would accept those reviews this year should they wish to submit them (i.e. an opt-in program is in effect). The idea that we would evaluate accredited programs this year was for their benefit, rather than for ours. Excomm requested that CAPR entertain a formal request from CEAS to permit them to delay the submission of their five-year review until next year and, should we agree to this, that we forward this recommendation to the Senate so that they might vote on the subject given the wording of the action they previously approved.

Since our last meeting, the administration has moved ahead with the budget planning process and how to accommodate projected budget reductions and the need for enrollment reduction in 2010-11. As a committee we have received no formal information from the Provost’s office as to how these budget cuts are likely to affect programs and their ability to continue offering the degrees and options that currently exist. Nor have we received any proposals concerning the suspension or elimination of programs for which there are formal policies and procedures in place that, as he understands it, involve CAPR oversight and consultation. Just this week there have been meetings between the administration and non-teaching employees concerning
position eliminations, position reclassifications (time-basis), and thus likely layoffs and reassignments of personnel. Apparently, there are a number of academic support positions that will be eliminated although he is not in possession of this list. Staff have been told that termination notices and reassignment advisories have been determined and issued based solely on seniority. However, this is being disputed since staff are aware of examples, for instance in CLASS, in which individuals with lower seniority appear to have been treated as more senior in the issuance of termination and reassignment actions. He would thus like to add a new business item agenda to this meeting which is a discussion of what CAPR should do, and particularly the Chair, to establish a more direct line of information concerning program implications of proposed reorganization and reduction measures and in particular to ensure that its governance functions are effectively and helpfully brought to bear in this process and on a timely basis.

He did get an email from Pat Jennings who indicated that there is likely to be a temporary suspension request forthcoming for the MA in Sociology due to teaching and advising limitations caused by the budget cuts – the Office of Graduates Studies and Academic Programs has been requested to stop accepting applicants to this program pending this formal request for program temporary suspension. Jennings voiced concerns re: students getting charged and not getting refunded for application fees. Opp suggested that we not close off applicants without mentoring, as application fees should be refunded.

Annual reports are due to the College Deans at the end of the Winter quarter according to 08-09 CAPR 23: “Each program will provide a brief Annual Report (1 page of text, 1 page of assessment results and discussion as described below, and 1 page of statistics as provided by Planning and Institutional Research through the Associate Vice President to be submitted to the College Dean and electronically to the Associate Vice President, Academic Programs & Grad Studies (designee for the Provost’s copy) and to the Academic Senate Office (end of Winter Quarter).” He has drafted a memo to this effect and it will be sent out to all program Chairs with copy to the College Deans and AVP of APGC tomorrow.

[Lee asked that CAPR discuss whether or not to take an official part in the restructuring process. Need to open the dialog so that there is an avenue for official participation. Opp suggested that that ought to be the role of the Senate Chair and the Executive Committee of the Senate. Lee feels that there needs to be more participation in the process for the faculty (procedural aspects for communication opened within shared governance).]

Ahiakpor called point of order for committee introductions. Opp/Lee suggested that there be a formal agenda item for a report from the AVP APGS designee.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   None.

5. New business
   a. Request for delay of 5-year review – CEAS programs

      M/S/ (Ugbah/White)
Ugbah asked about how the delayed campus review would impact the College’s next accreditation process and Lee responded that there would not be any impact on the schedule.

Jennings remarked that she was troubled about the miscommunication between the Senate’s interpretations of CAPR’s recommendation. CAPR’s meaning was that programs would need to opt in if they indeed wanted to go forward with their review. Lee responded that the committee’s language seemed clear.

Motion passed unanimously.

b. Philosophy Option Discontinuances

M/S/P (Ugbah/Jennings).

Lee was confused about the 2 documents – re: the revision document has all classes struck out. What we are losing are the structure and options for the degree. Jennings remarked that she had the same confusion as to what are the substitution courses. Opp noted that there is no error on the document and that there are no core courses, but that the degree map is done by an advisor. Lee observed that there are 60 majors in the program and wondered what the core courses would be. Opp remarked that the Request for Approval of Revision of the Degree Major in B.A. Philosophy is for information only. The committee voted only on the discontinuance of the current options in the Philosophy BA.

c. Discussion of Institutional Learning Outcomes referral

Opp – Background – WASC wanted the University/institution to create and assess institutional learning outcomes (ILO) for students and programs with the 5-year review process; outcomes specifically designed for a graduate of CSUEB. Donna Wiley is assisting with the institutional assessment process. What is the most appropriate body/group to develop policies, procedures, etc. for defining and assessing institutional learning outcomes? Dianne Rush-Woods recommended that there is only one group to start the process and felt that CAPR was the appropriate body. Opp and Dianne recommend that CAPR create a sub-committee to work on the issue of developing an assessment plan, after CAPR develops the ILOs.

Lee was concerned that the sub-committee suggested in Woods’ letter was not comprised of CAPR members. Opp responded that a sub-committee does not have to be comprised of actual members of CAPR. Lee remarked that CAPR’s role then would be to draft the list of Institutional Learning Outcomes. CAPR then would propose new policy and procedures to create a new sub-committee on the ILO.

Young remarked that the latest diversity report will include ILOs related to diversity as well.

Jennings noted that identifying ILOs is not a problem, but assessment and developing assessment instruments – this would be in addition to our normal Committee duties; would there be release time to work on this project? Opp noted that assessment does not need to be a lengthy process and by using sampling
when programs go through their 5-year review, we can create a rubric to use during the review process. Jennings remarked that we need to be clear on what the assessment instrument should be. Lee stated that, with less than a month to work on the issue this quarter, we can use the ILOs suggested in Woods’ letter and then create a sub-committee. Jennings would like to hear from the assessment person before we make our decision. Young shared her concerns regarding our creating the ILOs: what model are we going to use, who will be at the table, and might it be that we are adding another layer to the 5-year review? How do we assess and what the structure will be are the issues, not what we assess. We don’t have the infrastructure in place now. Ugbah wondered how, after we have identified the ILOs, and incorporated them into the 5-year review process, CAPR would move this along within the time frame given; and how we would create a uniform assessment tool for the whole campus? Lee noted that we need to take into account the history of the last 2 years – CAPR attempted to integrate a high level of assessment into the 5-year review process, but these attempts were refused – and didn’t yield a model. As this is coming from ExComm, perhaps the attempt will be successful this time around. Ugbah suggested that our job is to formalize the process, then come up with an assessment plan. Opp concurred with Steve that we not make additional work – a simple and elegant solution is good; they never expect you to assess everything every time. We can assess one ILO one year, then another ILO the next year; not assess all ILOs every year. In terms of WASC, they are asking that we show that we have samples of ILOs for programs – not assessing everything every year.

Lee will create a document for the Committee to discuss at the next meeting. Each committee member can look at the academic plan and develop our thinking along with candidate list of ILOs – as well as ask for this from Wiley, too.

Ugbah mentioned that we need to formally accept the charge to formalize the process.

M/S/P (White/Ugbah) that CAPR agrees to accept the ExComm charge to develop Institutional Learning Outcomes and Assessment plan.

Lee will confer with Donna Wiley to help draft a document to review at our next meeting.

d. Discussion of CAPR Assessment Sub-committee

Opp – here to represent Donna Wiley regarding the assessment discussion. CAPR will discuss at the next meeting.

7. Other business

Lee voiced concern that faculty do not seem to have much of a voice in the discussion regarding the suspension or discontinuance of programs; CAPR ought to be involved in the discussion on a campus-wide basis.

Ugbah remarked that we may not be the decision-makers but we are the Senate’s Academic & Planning Committee, established to monitor the quality of programs on campus; if we are not involved, why are we here; CAPR ought to be briefed and
ought to know what is going on and offered a chance to discuss and review any changes. Somehow we need to find a mechanism to keep CAPR informed. Lee would like to formally invite the provost and new provost to come to CAPR where we can raise our concerns regarding shared governance. We should also bring to the attention of the deans that CAPR knows that program changes are being done/discussed on campus and we need to be part of that discussion.

Opp remarked that CAPR is the standing committee, etc., but the body of the Senate, with the leadership of ExComm, is the decision making body. Issues are funneled through the standing committees via ExComm. The Senate Chair does communicate regularly with the deans, vps, etc. on campus. These sorts of decisions need to be funneled through the faculty Senate and its attendant committees. She suggested that Lee work with the Senate chair about this before taking any action. Ugbah thinks that ExComm should ask to meet with the incoming Provost. Manopoulos agreed that we need to have a good working relationship with ExComm as we are here to advise. Jennings suggested that we invite the Senate chair to a meeting. Lee agreed that it would be best if he discussed CAPR’s concerns with the Senate chair and report back to the committee.

8. Adjournment

M/S/P (Ahiakpor/Ouyang).