TO: Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

FROM: The Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR)

SUBJECT: Expression of CAPR concerns regarding New Program Process & Timetables

PURPOSE: To Inform ExComm of CAPR concerns and seek advice

ACTION REQUESTED: Request for Advice

When the Ed. D. was presented to CAPR, committee members were concerned in advance about a) the short timeline and b) the implied assumption that the program would be approved. This was not a reflection on the Ed. D. proposal, but a concern about process. Members, however, viewed the situation as an exception where circumstances were driven by the campus being on the quarter system and causing a time crunch with the Chancellor’s Office.

Now, committee members are presented with the same short timelines again, this time for a proposal for a new Construction Management program and proposals from Recreation/Leisure Studies. This time, we have been told that the speed factor is the new university catalog. Once again, this is not a reflection on these programs (this memo is being written prior to the receipt of any documents from either program), but there is an inherent assumption, once again, that all will automatically be approved. As a result, the concerns of the committee have returned.

While CAPR has the right to and will recommend any path of action deemed appropriate, the inherent assumptions are what troubles us most. At the Senate meeting where the Ed. D. was approved, the Chair of CAPR was asked why the committee approved the program when it was accompanied by serious reservations concerning resources, particularly budget. While the CAPR vote had been unanimous in favor of approval, in retrospect, there are indications that it might not have been, that the committee might have asked for a revision and a new discussion before moving to recommend approval.

The appearance of a similar scenario for upcoming programs has firmed the committee’s resolve to assess programs entirely on their merit and not to be influenced by time constraints. We draw this to the Executive Committee’s attention as a matter of information and for any advice that ExComm members might be able to provide as to how to help programs engage in the review process in a manner that permits appropriate reflection by CAPR. No serious review of proposals can be undertaken with such short timelines. We sincerely hope that recent events surrounding programs will not continue.