

CAAC Meeting Minutes
September 26, 2017

Voting Representatives Present: Jim Hunt, Barbara Bryson, Renée Clift, Pam Perry, Lisa Ordóñez, Jim Baygents, Martina Shenal, Janet Sturman, Kimberly Jones, Keith Swisher, Amanda Gluski (for Mary Koithan), John Koshel, Ted Tong, Chris Tisch, Elliott Cheu, Amy Kimme-Hea, Barbara Citera

Additional Representatives Present: Pam Coonan, Chrissy Lieberman, Cynthia Demetriou, Martin Marquez

Absent (without proxy): Lucinda Rankin

Chair Kim Jones called the meeting to order at 11:00 AM.

I. Approval of Minutes from the August 22, 2017 Meeting

Chris Tisch moved to approve the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Jim Hunt and approved.

II. Items for Discussion and Vote

a) Undergraduate Minor in Critical Languages- Jeiun Ryu

Critical Language Program offers coursework in languages not commonly taught/offered on campus. The program typically has 350 students involved in the program each semester. Students have expressed an interest in earning a minor in critical languages. Currently unavailable. The program wants to offer a minor like those in other foreign languages. The minor will allow students to be recognized for their coursework and proficiency. In addition, having the opportunity to earn a minor may encourage students to continue their learning and development of higher language proficiency.

Discussion:

- No questions nor discussion

Jim Baygents moved to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded by Barbara Citera and it passed with 16 votes.

b) Institutional Learning Outcomes- Group Discussion

CAAC members met with Elaine Marchello to work on the UA Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO). Those attending the meeting reported that overall, the group was fairly comfortable with the stated outcomes. However, the framing document, specifically the preamble section, needs work. The preamble section should include information on the purpose and partnerships between academic degree and general education programs driving the outcomes.

Discussion:

- Did the committee discuss where outcomes would be assessed? CAAC member reported that Elaine Marchello gave assurances that several outcomes would be assessed in general education program. Expectation that academic programs would evaluate/assess ILO where they are covered within the academic program and would be included as part of the APR and accreditation. In areas not covered by the academic program, accessible data would be provided to departments from general education program on how those are addressed. This is a shared endeavor.
- What is the time commitment required for mapping these outcomes? CAAC member reported that Elaine Marchello stated that time commitment should not be increased significantly for department assessment contacts. Taskstream will manage much of this and make it less time intensive. CAAC members expressed concern regarding the amount of time

commitment for data-handling including uploading assessment data for accreditation, APR, etc.. These concerns will still need to be addressed.

- How will the data be aggregated and displayed in Taskstream? Information still forthcoming. CAAC member reported that Elaine stated it would be addressed and handled but is still a work in progress.
- How will the ILO be assessed? This is still a work in progress. The ILO committee has a plan, but has not been implemented yet. Reasonable to request Elaine come back to CAAC and provide an update.
- Why doesn't general education handle addressing ILO? Was stacking discussed? CAAC member explained that the initial concern was that general education program set the outcomes. Rather, the partnership between academic and general education programs should set the outcomes. Individual programs may not hit all of the outcomes, but general education partnership would.
- How is general education evaluating learning outcomes? CAAC members concerned about assessment. Preamble should state the shared responsibility to meeting the ILO. Any stated learning outcome requires assessment data to see that students are meeting those outcomes. Concerns still exist regarding data collection from general education program. Data needs to be collected regarding how general education is addressing ILO. Gail has plans to start a self-study of general education.
- Ingrid and Elaine asked to come to the next CAAC meeting.

Janet Sturman moved to approve the institutional learning outcomes and invite OIA-Assessment Leadership Team to revise the preamble. The motion was seconded by Jim Baygents and approved with 15 votes and 1 abstention.

- c) **Masters of Science in Medical Studies** – Ron Hammer, Stephanie Hatlestad, and Maria Manriquez
Proposing this program to build and allow COM-Phoenix to offer more curriculum credit to students. The proposed program is a result of faculty and student feedback. It would allow students exposure to more curriculum and qualify for financial aid.

Discussion with presenters:

- Who is the intended audience? Students interested in investigating medical studies for applying to medical school and/or health-related professions. Students seriously considering going to medical school and may not have adequately prepared.
- Is there an ASU connection between ASU's BS in Medical Studies? This program is more advanced study. Students pursuing this would look to prepare for MCAT. This is not a pre-medical curriculum.
- Are there majors that you foresee that could not come into this program? Pre-requisites for this program are common to medical school. Students in any discipline that take the pre-medical school curriculum would be a fit for this program.
- Why is there a lack of specificity for admission into the program- inconsistent with other graduate programs? Although upper division coursework isn't specified as part of admission the additional requirement is to complete the MCAT test and a composite score. Standard language for medical school and possibly nursing.
- Why is this needed when the current certificate is working? Initial proposal for the current certificate included offering a MS. Decided not to pursue the MS option at that time. However, faculty and student feedback supports offering a MS. Furthermore, student feedback on financial aid included the difficulty of certificate participants to maintain balance of working fulltime and certificate requirements.
- Why the MCAT part of requirement for program? So students do not have to focus on that exam during the completion of their curriculum.

- Is this program sustainable? Requested continued sponsorship from current sponsors. Will continue to seek sponsorships. Students pay minimal tuition and this may be adjusted. Graduate certificate is not eligible for financial aid, but with masters will make them eligible for financial aid. Scholarships may be available as well.
- What percentage of students do you believe will be successful in getting into medical school? The graduate certificate had ten out of ten students matriculated in the first year, nine out of ten in second year, and ten out of ten in third year.

Discussion without presenters:

- CAAC member requested that the proposal be simplified, made straightforward. The program targets students that are not prepared for medical school. However, proposed curriculum will not be used to prepare students for the MCAT since pre-medical curriculum is completed before entering the program. This goal is similar to the PMAP program in that it is a bridge/pathway for students going to the UA Medical School, but at Phoenix. Student feedback requested this program. Year-long program, 31 units.
- The proposal is an effort to move the graduate certificate to masters. Doing this to get financial aid for students since certificates are ineligible for financial aid. This would increase the amount of student loans. If the certificate is working, why is this needed? Success rate is high.
- Why not PMAP at Phoenix? Due to College of Medicine Phoenix having ABOR approval for separate curriculum and COM-Phoenix wants to manage it this way (separately). Proposal should compare the curriculum with PMAP.
- The budget responses needs to be articulated more. The discussion from the presenters implied tuition may rise. Sponsorships will cover the small group of students in the program, which is capped at 10. These students need money for living expenses.
- Will this program cut down time for completing medical school? Not stated, but suspect the answer is no since the curriculum is different. The degree gives them more status in their medical school pathway. They apply to medical school when they apply to program. It would be an automatic move.
- What percentage of students are coming from UA? NAU? Not given.
- CAAC member expressed concern around the rationale for this program being needed to help a subset of specific student population. If approved, this implies that students in that targeted subset need the additional cost and curriculum in order to get into medical school. What do these classes do for students?
- Recruitment tool to recruit students that may not be able
- Would the graduate certificate stay? The proposal is to replace the certificate. Has limit of 10 students. Has ramifications on sponsorship—will they be willing to pay more?
- Kim requested CAAC members send questions and will compile a list of questions to send to the presenters.

Proposal was tabled. [Update: 10/3 CAAC chair Kim Jones forwarded comments and questions to MMS proposers. MMS response received and an e-vote was conducted starting 10/9. The proposal was approved with 14 e-votes. Proposers were notified on 10/16]

d) Master of Healthcare Management – Stephen Gilliland

A business degree with foundation courses in MBA with healthcare management courses. Includes three concentrations. Fully online degree with coursework borrowed from MBA and MIS. Newly developed courses will also be offered to online MBA and MIS students as electives. The degree is an opportunity to connect with the healthcare community. It includes a capstone project. Conversations have occurred with Banner regarding projects.

Discussion:

- Is this program 1 year and 30 units? Yes, students can complete the program in 1 year. Not lockstep.
- What is the target audience? Envisioning PharmD or MD students in residency programs. Possibly early medical field career students. Additional potential students group includes health science undergraduates that decide not to pursue a health career, but may want to go into a health-related business field. Having this offered online allows for those different populations to complete the program.
- Are there people/soft skills course? There are people skills in healthcare management organization and change management classes.
- Are the courses planned offered as UAOnline and main campus? Yes, looking at icourses for main campus. There is potential to partner with other departments in having students take healthcare management coursework.
- Why are the admission requirements so broad? How are the foundation courses different than undergraduate level courses? Foundation courses can help students get the necessary background. The foundation courses are higher-level and cover more material.

Discussion without presenter:

- CAAC member expressed concern that the foundational survey of finance course does not appear to be at graduate level. Lisa stated these are high level and are not at the undergraduate level. These are courses already taught at the graduate level including online MBA and online MIS coursework required of graduate students.
- What cost is this program? Lisa stated that it appears to be the same price as MBA which is \$2,000 a unit; \$60,000 for the year.

Renee Clift moved to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded by Jim Baygents and approved with 14 votes and 2 abstentions.

e) CAAC Bylaws-Kim Jones

Edit wording regarding quorum to “Quorum is 51% of voting members”.

Jim Hunt moved to approve the bylaws when corrected. The motion was seconded by Renee Clift and approved with 15 votes. One member stepped out before discussion.

f) ECON BA move from SBS to Eller-Lisa Ordóñez and Amy Kimme-Hea

Currently, the ECON BS is in Eller while the ECON BA is in SBS. Signed agreement with the deans of SBS and Eller to move ECON BA from SBS to Eller. The agreement includes stipulations that ECON BA students have a minimum GPA of 2.5, create a pre-ECON BA that includes the pre-program fee matching that of Eller pre-business, and adding a required 3 unit lower division business communication course. Aware that there may be a loss of students since the GPA requirement was not a part of the ECON BA. ECON BA students will receive the same services that Eller students receive. SBS fully supports the move. Student’s real identity is with Eller and not SBS. SBS does not determine the curriculum or have oversight. Current ECON BA students are grandfathered students who are at UA. Students in SBS ECON BA now will graduate in spring and summer. Students will have a choice and will not be subject to GPA requirements. The 2.5 GPA requirement begins for students starting Fall 2018. ECON BS students without the minimum 2.75 GPA would be able to switch/declare ECON BA as long as they had the minimum GPA.

Renee Clift moved to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded by Elliott Cheu and approved with 14 votes and 1 abstention. One member stepped out before discussion.

III. Additional Items-Open Discussion

- a) **Degree Map**-messaging from Meredith Aronson about Degree Map launch date pushed to September 2018 to allow Civitas to fully resolve some issues.
- b) **Free Speech**-Renee Clift
Would CAAC be interested in discussing free speech and protecting junior or non-tenured faculty. Chrissy will be happy to have people present to CAAC.
- c) **Courses on 10-Day Review**-Amy Kimme-Hea
Amy asked for input from CAAC members on how colleges are handling objections. CAAC members made suggestions including sending the 10 day review report to departments and structuring messaging in a constructive way. Amy provides guidelines including looking for 50% or more overlap of content and course description, assignments, objectives, and outcomes. However, there is no guidelines or process for how to deal with course objections. CALS has curriculum committee members look at potential overlap and encourages meeting with departments. **Why are courses past the 10 day review still showing on the report?** Does a disservice to the courses since they aren't removed from the list. Curricular affairs gets involved in course objections as last resort. Members discussed providing some consistency of how to approach course objections. **How/what are colleges doing to handle disputes?** College of Education suggested two representatives from departments read syllabi and have talks. Other members recommended working with college curriculum committees.

IV. Meeting Adjourned

Respectfully Submitted by **Martin Marquez, 10/5/17**