

APC Report as of February 28, 2008

Submitted by Rika Yoshii

APC meets every Wednesday from 3-4pm in KEL 3013

- Concurrent master's credit (GSC) – We have forwarded to EC a new policy on allowing undergraduate students to gain graduate course units in their final semester.
- GVAR (GSC) – Currently, we are finalizing a new policy on Graduation Writing Assessment for graduate students.
- CLEP and IB – We are collecting and organizing data on how CLEP and IB credits are awarded at other CSU campuses in order to develop our own policies.
- People Soft – We are collecting information on how People Soft will impact the Fall registration through automated checks (pre-requisite courses, excess units, repeated courses, etc.) We will report to EC soon.

Future Items:

- Standards and Goals for Online courses

Please send any comments or questions to ryoshii@csusm.edu

FAC Report to the Academic Senate

March 5, 2008

Members: Betsy Read (Faculty at Large) Chair: Mayra Besosa (Lecturer), Soheila Jorjani (CoBA), Janet McDaniel (Faculty at Large), Carmen Nava (Faculty At Large), Ann Fiegen (Library), Lance Newman (CFA), Fran Chadwick (CoE), Mayra Besosa (Lecturer), Mary Elizabeth Stivers (AVP-AR)

1. **CoBA RTP Document:** Revisions to the CoBA RTP Document are nearly complete and are expected to be moved to the Senate for a first reading in April.
2. **Political Science RTP Document:** The Political Science RTP Document was reviewed and was sent back to the department for revisions.
3. **Evaluation of Coaches:** Procedures developed by the Department of Athletics for the annual evaluation of head and assistant coaches were reviewed and revisions by are underway.
4. **UPD/RSC Grant Review:** Review of the 22 UPD/RSC grants submitted for the 2008 call is in progress. Approximately \$110,000 is expected to be awarded. FAC thanks President Haynes who has agreed to fund the UPD/RSC grants in the future.
5. **Faculty Grants Committee Policy:** A policy is being drafted in collaboration with Gerry Gonzalez for a new Faculty Grants Committee (FGC) to conduct the review process of applications for university-wide faculty grants related to professional development and research, scholarship, and creative activities.
6. **Faculty Survey on Student Evaluation:** Analysis of the results from the faculty survey on the student course evaluation forms and process, is underway. A 29% return rate was obtained. While the returns were representative across the colleges/schools, a proportionately lower return from temporary faculty was evidenced.

Other work in Progress:

Inclusion of Temporary Faculty into University Life

Review of the President's Award for

LATAC Report to Executive Committee and Senate

March 5, 2008

LATAC Committee Members

Chair, Joan Hanor, CoE; Shaoyi He, CoBA; Sajith Jayasinghe, CoAs; Youwen Ouyang, CoAS; Sue Thompson, Library Faculty; Chris Ashley, Library Staff; Robert Erichsen, IITS Staff; Marion Reid, Dean of Library; Linda Scott, Director, Academic Technology; Wayne Veres, Dean of IITS; Chad Huggins, AA staff at large; Kai Norwood, Student Representative at Large.

CSU Security Policy

Teresa Macklin led us through a review of the CSU Security Policy. Both Teresa and Wayne Veres serve on system-wide committees that will have opportunities to provide further feedback. The CSU legal departments as well as experts in procurement and human resources are also reviewing the Policy. A revision will be provided in June while a coded memorandum will likely be available in August. Teresa reminded the committee that the Policy is to provide a system-wide baseline since different campuses have uneven levels of security in place. It is likely that our local security policy has exceeded the baseline policy in some areas and will not be affected by the Policy.

Instructional Materials Accessibility Plan (IMAP)

Recent system-wide meetings held in Los Angeles and attended by Linda Scott, Robert Erichsen, Barbara Taylor and Shaoyi He have provided further assistance for advancing CSU plans for making instructional materials accessible. High on the list is the need for a communication plan to facilitate getting information out to people on campus. Hopefully, reports such as provided by LATAC to Exec and Senate, and augmented by multiple campus messages and communications will contribute to a community understanding and the ability for faculty to contribute to the process of making materials accessible to all students.

The first courses that will need to be fully accessible will be the ones that are taught for the first time in fall of 2008. By fully accessible, this entails the format of all course texts and print-based instructional materials, any PowerPoint presentations, Web Sites, and course materials. Faculty have the full support of IITS in helping to design and create accessible course materials. If you expect to teach a brand new course, meaning this is the first time it is being offered, you should contact Linda Scott for help as soon as possible. She will work closely with you to provide the expert advice, support, and necessary resources to help get your course materials ready for the start of the fall '08 semester.

In addition to new courses, every course at the point of redesign also has to be fully accessible for Fall 2008.

The final date is fall of 2012 in which all courses should be fully accessible.

Questions that have arisen include, "How do you identify the courses that are being taught for the first time? If a "P" form is not necessarily an indicator, might there be another way to track courses being taught for the first time and then notify faculty of the need to prepare accessible materials?"

Accessibility Technology Initiative (ATI) Team

The ATI team from the Chancellor's office will be visiting our campus on Weds. March 19. Members of that team include Debra Kaplan and Mark Turner. Debra will be making a presentation to the DACC Committee. We will also have an open meeting that day, March 19 at 2:15 to provide faculty and staff an opportunity to talk to the ATI Team about the process of making instructional materials accessible. Linda Scott will be sending out an invitation with meeting location. We urge your attendance and invite you to contribute your questions and concerns.

Alternate Text

Robert Erichsen reported that the past December and January had been a busy and labor-intensive period when IITS processed 127 requests for alternate text. Two requests were satisfied by e-file available from the publisher. 26 books were located from repositories such as RFB and CAM databases. So no conversion was required. The first ever in-house production of e-Text has converted 56 books and 29 articles. 14 books were sent to vendor to reproduce. The in-house production has the advantage of quicker turn-around and wider range of format. Robert had attended several training sessions in e-Text production and is currently taking a Braille class through San Diego City Schools.

PAC report to Senate March 2008

1. Annual Assessment reports were received from all programs except one. PAC made recommendations for funding in 3 categories – those we believed were focused on assessment and should be funded, those we felt could be funded but needed some clarification, and those which we were not able to recommend – mostly because we did not see the connection between their funding request and the assessment of student learning. These recommendations were reviewed by both the Provost and David Barsky, as well as discussed with the Deans. Notifications were sent out shortly after semester started. For this cycle 14 different requests were funded ranging from \$400 to \$3075. In total \$71,105 were requested and \$ 39,482 were funded. Some requests could not be funded such as gifts or incentives for students taking a test; food is also not fundable.
2. As part of the Annual Assessment reports all programs have developed programmatic student learning outcomes. These were reviewed by PAC using some guidelines that we developed, but since then we have found a rubric being used by WASC during their Educational Effectiveness campus visits and hope to use this in the future. PAC review was solely to develop some idea of the campus standing in relation to learning outcomes. These were subsequently sent to Peggy Maki. Her feedback was sent to the individual programs and many used it to revise their outcomes prior to their incorporation into the upcoming University Catalog.
3. Included with this report are a flowchart of the cycle including annual assessment reports and a chart describing the changes between the campus PEP and the new Program Review cycle that PAC will bring to Senate next month.
4. To follow-up on the PAC resolution requesting support for assessment which was passed by Senate in Spring 2006, and recognizing the need for additional support and guidance in the assessment process, the PAC has developed a proposal for an Assessment Fellow. This would be a faculty position that would serve as a resource for those programs undergoing program review and for all in developing annual assessment plans. See agenda item.

Sketch of comparison of old and new Program Review Procedures

OLD VERSION	NEW VERSION
Took 2 years repeated every 5 years	Is on-going
Comprehensive review	Comprehensive but focused on student learning and assessment.
Department addresses 9 issues one of which is student learning outcomes. Others are design of degree program, student readiness, graduates, advising, enrollments, pedagogy and instruction, resources, and extracurricular activities.	Process focuses on student learning but department can also select 1-2 of the other areas to study.
Data Notebook required departmental action	Most of the Notebook is online at assessment website. Input from various administrative offices. Faculty contribute small pieces throughout the process.
Lack of guidance of structure of narrative.	FAQs, self-study guide and page-limit, and PAC meetings provide guidance and support. Assessment website includes documents to help faculty in process such as timelines and checklists.
No annual assessment reports	Annual assessment reports required with 2 years off for analysis/reflection and writing self-study report.
Little or no specific funding or support.	Funding support provided. Provided support through consultant on PSLOs. Assessment Faculty Fellow position.
Usually one reviewer	Looking to provide 2 external reviewers for each visit whenever possible
Planning report required	Additional structure for planning report includes system of recognition of goals and plans as well as acknowledgement of support for reaching those goals and plans.
Few specifics on Masters programs	Section for graduate programs provided.
Senate received end of year report.	Senate received copies of PAC final response to departments. PAC reports to Senate on common elements across all reviews. Plus online program portfolio includes many PR documents.
Includes system for ad-hoc committee to review viability of program	Same

PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

Years 1-3



Early Fall

Annual Assessment
Plan



Late Spring

Annual Assessment
Report

Year 4



Fall

Select Program Review
Coordinator, meet with PAC,
and select self-study focus



Spring

Complete review & write
Program Review Report



Summer

Department submits Program
Review Report to Dean

Year 5



Fall

External Reviewer Site visit
Department receives External
Reviewer Report



Spring

Department responds to External
Reviewer Reports and Additional
Reader responses

1. We finished the review of changes for the catalog reconciliation cycle.
2. We finished our work on the new P-Form template.
3. We started the review of the proposed Major in Global Studies.
4. We worked on the review of several courses from Biology, Chemistry, Literature and Writing, Mass Media, Communication, Political Sciences, and Psychology.

For current information (minutes) about the UCC meetings see
<http://www.csusm.edu/cwis/ohansen/UCC.html>.

Submitted by Olaf Hansen.