



**TO:** Jennifer Summit, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

**FROM:** Alvin N. Alvarez, Dean of the College of Health & Social Sciences

**DATE:** April 27, 2018

**RE:** Child and Adolescent Development's Program (CAD's) Seventh Cycle Dean's Response

The external reviewers for the seventh-cycle review of the Child and Adolescent Development's program provide both laudatory comments as well as important and insightful recommendations for this program's improvement. The external reviewers note of the "*The CAD faculty are remarkably dedicated. While the number of tenured/tenure-track faculty is small (especially in proportion to the size of the program and given the expected growth), they are very productive in both research and service. The non-tenure track faculty are also very committed and most have been with the department for a long period.*" They also noted that "*The CAD faculty are very collegial. They support each other in both teaching and research and go far beyond reasonable expectations for service...*" They also note the faculty's commitment to the field and to the SF State campus. Additionally, they speak to the innovative ways in which CAD faculty have been engaged in student success efforts. I share the positive sentiments and observations made by the external reviewers, and I appreciate the attention to detail in the reports that have been produced as part of this seventh-cycle review.

The external reviewers offered the following recommendations for programmatic improvement of the CAD program:

- 1 Increase Developmental Content
- 2 Increase Course Consistency
- 3 Increase Assigned Time
- 4 Secure Additional Tenure-Track Lines
- 5 Allocate More Space
- 6 Increase High-Impact Practices (HIPs)

**Dean's Recommendation:**

Before going into my recommendations related to the CAD program review, I want to express my appreciation to the CAD faculty who participated in their self-study and to the external reviewers who wrote a thoughtful report that acknowledged CAD's strengths and also identified areas in need of programmatic improvement. I agree with the majority of the conclusions reached in the self-study and the recommendations offered in the external review report. I will, however, focus my commentary and recommendations on what I believe are CAD's programmatic priorities. Regarding the recommendation

that CAD increase developmental content in the major, particularly by expanding CAD 410 into a year-long experience, I recommend leaving it to CAD's curriculum committee about how to best incorporate more study of development of children and youth into the curriculum. Given CAD's financial constraints along with the fact that CAD is a small department with limited faculty, I would not want to pressure them to make CAD 410 a stretch course. I do, however, think that the external reviewers' suggestion about adding more content in this area should be taken seriously. Perhaps CAD can consider integrating content about development of children and youth throughout its curriculum. Along the lines of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) being aligned to reflect CAD's priorities, I heartily recommend that the faculty work to ensure that this happen soon. Further, I suggest that CAD do "curricular mapping" in which course syllabi include SLOs that support PLOs in a thoughtful and coordinated way. In light of the external reviewers' suggestion that CAD reduce its choices of a multitude of courses in the pathways, I leave that to the best judgment of CAD faculty, but ask that they consider tightening up the course offerings where it makes sense. I do agree wholeheartedly that the CAD major include signature assignments common to particular courses to assist with meaningful assessment of student learning in the major. I think this would be enormously helpful and it is an important way of doing assessment. The external reviewers also suggest that the department chair and associate chair be awarded additional assigned time and that a faculty member in CAD be given assigned time for advising responsibilities. While I appreciate this suggestion in principle, it important to recognize that the Chair's timebase is based on university-wide allocations and to address this issue for a singular department without addressing allocations throughout the various departments within the college or university would be problematic and would raise concerns around equity. Given that this is an important and valid issue, I believe that this would be an important issue for Academic Affairs – as a Division – to address more systemically rather an issue for CHSS or CAD alone. With respect to assigned time for associate chairs, it has been a relatively new practice of the college to allocate 0.2 in assigned time to associate chairs for one semester to support administrative workload and promote succession planning. To the best of my knowledge, CHSS is the only college to provide this level of support among any of the colleges and to provide further support is not financially feasible. I do not agree with the recommendation that CAD be permitted to provide assigned time for a faculty member to do advising beyond the standard expectations tenure-track faculty members have for student advising. My reluctance has to do with issues of finances to cover CAD's expenses along with the issue of equity across the College. Next, the external reviewers suggested that CAD be permitted to hire more tenure-track faculty members. Although tenure-track hires are a priority for CAD, such requests will be contingent on a number of factors including but not limited to (a) availability of funding; and (b) alignment with department, college, university, and community priorities (i.e., enrollment demand, curricular need, workforce demands, etc). Another recommendation was to assign CAD with more space for private faculty offices, a conference room, designated classroom space, and student space. Quite frankly, space is extraordinarily tight throughout the college and the space within the Science Building – in which the department is housed – is largely controlled by the College of Science and Engineering. Should space become available for CAD conference room or for dedicated student space the College would certainly consider this, but at this time such space is not available. CAD is urged to reserve conference space in the College (e.g., HSS 233 and 224), and general student space is currently being planned in the HSS building and CAD students – along with all CHSS students – will be encouraged to use it for academic and social purposes. Finally, the external reviewers recommended that CAD engage in high impact practices (HIPs) and I support and encourage CAD faculty to implement such practices. There are a variety of ways CAD can do so and I leave it up to the faculty to integrate HIPs into the CAD major.

I am pleased with the depth of thought and effort that went into the seventh-cycle review for the Child and Adolescent Development undergraduate program. There were many instances in the self-study as well as in the external reviewers' report that pointed out the many assets CAD possesses. This review also highlighted areas in which CAD can develop into an even better program. Ultimately, the outcome has been positive and I look forward to CADs continued success in strengthening its major and serving our students.