

## **Program Performance Review: Culmination Meeting Memo Health Science – B.S.**

The 2015-2016 Program Performance Review (PPR) process for Health Science – B.S. programs concluded with a culmination meeting on March 3, 2017.

The following people attended the meeting: Anil Puri (Provost), Pamela Oliver (AVPAP), Laurie Rodes (Dean, HHD), Cindy Greenberg (Associate Dean, HHD), Sora Tanjasiri (Chair), Lilia Espinoza (Faculty), Joshua Yang (Faculty), Archana McEligot (Faculty), Danny Kim (Faculty), and Su Swarat (Director of Assessment and Educational Effectiveness).

The Provost congratulated the program for successfully completing the PPR process. The program was commended for the significant accomplishments it has made since the last PPR. Major highlights, recommendations and concerns raised through the PPR process were discussed as follows.

### **1. Faculty scholarly productivity:**

- The Health Science faculty are applauded for being very productive, engaged scholars, widely recognized for their knowledge and expertise.
- The AVPAP highlighted that all faculty members have created research centers or institutes, which is very impressive.

### **2. Curriculum improvement:**

- The department has worked diligently to re-evaluate and revise the undergraduate curriculum. The department was encouraged by the external reviewers to continue thoughtful redesign of the major curriculum with emphasis in writing, public speaking, APA format, cultural competency, and critical thinking skills.
- The Chair commented that several new courses have been developed or are in development to reorganize the curriculum in order to accommodate the increasing and changing student population. The faculty work collaboratively to refocus the curriculum, and to provide clarity to the students – help students understand what being a Health Science major means.
- The faculty indicated that there are more 300 level courses for the major to support the five concentrations and options. The faculty are also examining how the new courses could support the GE curriculum at the university. The course development effort was partially supported by external funding, and ongoing institutional support is needed to sustain the curriculum development effort for all 14 tenure/tenure-track faculty members.

### **3. Department growth:**

- The department has seen significant growth in the past several years. The Chair stated that it is the largest Health Science department in the CSU. The department is considered a “model” on many fronts, including faculty successfully achieving tenure, faculty being productive teacher scholars, student access to a variety of classes and research opportunities, and student career options after graduation.
- The Dean confirmed the Chair’s statement, commending the department for its excellent leadership, student involvement in research, and faculty productivity. She pointed out, however, the increasing demands on faculty as enrollment grows. The college is working on how to re-allocate resources in an equitable manner to support faculty.

**Program Performance Review: Culmination Meeting Memo**  
**Health Science – B.S.**

- Both the Chair and the faculty voiced the need for more tenure line faculty, particularly faculty with different expertise. The Provost has approved 2 positions this year, and agreed to continue to support as much as possible.
  - The Chair reported that the department has recently hired a full-time lecturer to spearhead internship and student success initiatives, and is considering long-term planning in terms of faculty needs in this regard.
  - The department was asked to consider its ideal size to make it sustainable and at the same time, meet the needs of the campus. The possibility of impaction was discussed. The faculty expressed the concern that impaction may run contrary to the department's mission of social justice, and limit access to some students who could flourish through the curriculum. The Chair also questioned the FTES-based funding model, and how impaction might affect funding. She suggested the inclusion of program quality in the metrics for funding determination.
4. Space challenges:
- The Chair and the faculty voiced that space is a major challenge, both in terms of office space and lab/research space.
  - One particularly needed space is a wet lab. This is a concern for disciplinary accreditation, and a factor that has led to faculty departure. One faculty member stated that he had to completely change his research focus due to the lack of a wet lab. The department has tried to collaborate with NSM or ECS on this issue with little success.
  - The Provost noted the lab/space need, which will be taken into consideration in the university-wide conversations regarding space allocation. The Dean is also conducting an intra-college space analysis, and will strive to provide equitable space allocations through discussions within the college.
  - The possibility of having a wet lab at the Irvine campus was discussed. While this is a possibility, the Chair and the AVPAP emphasized that adequate student services and co-curricular activities need to be in place at Irvine as well to ensure equitable student learning experiences.

The Provost concluded the meeting by commending and thanking the contribution by the Health Science faculty to the students, the university, and the community. The Chair emphasized the enormously collegial faculty who care about students and support each other. She also thanked the Dean's office for its transparent decision-making and continuing support.