Minutes of the Meeting of April 19, 2001

Members Present: Carol Becker, Beverly Dixon, Jennifer Eagan, Jane Lopus-Chair, Eric Suess, and Mary Timney

Members Absent: Jennifer Laherty, Frank Martino, Bijan Mashaw (present for agenda items 7 and 8)

Guests: John Hammerback, Felix Herndon, Doug Weiss

The meeting was called to order by Chair Lopus at 2:05 P.M. in the President's Conference Room.

1. Approval of the Agenda: M/S/P to approve as amended.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of April 5, 2001: M/S/P as amended.

3. Report of the Chair:
   - The outside reviewer for Human Development came on April 12-13. Human Development hopes to finish their report to CAPR during this academic year.
   - The outside reviewer for the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry is scheduled to come April 30. Jane Lopus will contact Leroy Chauffe about the timing of their report to CAPR.
   - Lopus will notify the programs (and their deans) scheduled for five-year reviews in 2001-2002, as required in the new Policies and Procedures for Five Year Reviews and Plans. Programs scheduled for review need to be sent copies of this document. However, President Rees needs to approve the document before this can be done.
   - CAPR discussed how switching from quarters to semesters would affect the five-year review schedule, should the switch occur. It was decided that CAPR's memo to programs scheduled for review next year should state that the effect is unknown at this time.
   - CAPR needs to formally request to have the program review date for Health Care Administration changed from 2004-05 to 2005-06. Mary Timney will send a request to Leigh Mintz to be referred to the Chancellor on behalf of CAPR.
   - The Executive Committee voted to send CAPR's report on Geology's Five Year Program Review to the Senate.


5. Proposed Discontinuance of the Kinesiology & Physical Education Coaching Certificate:
   Doug Weiss reported that the Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education would like to discontinue the Coaching Certificate and eliminate it from the University Catalog. The requirements for becoming a coach have changed, and the department no longer offers many of the courses listed for the certificate. There is no enrollment in this certificate program, and continuing to list it in the catalog is misleading.
M/S/P to recommend discontinuation of the Coaching Certificate. (Ayes 6, nays 0)

6. Five Year Program Review for Mass Communication:
The Department of Mass Communication was last reviewed in 1986-1987. Last year CAPR granted the department a one-year delay since they planned to merge with the Department of Speech Communication. Because the merger is still pending (expected to take place by fall 2002) CAPR arranged with the department to complete a modified review this year.

John Hammerback answered questions from CAPR about the program, the planned merger, and the materials submitted. An outside reviewer visited the department in 1996 and made several suggestions regarding the proposed merger at that time. The proposed Department of Communication has the full support of both existing departments. Both majors would continue, but there would be six core courses that would help the departments to work together. Many aspects of the current mass communications program are going very well (e.g. the Pioneer) and there are plans for improvement in other areas (e.g. the radio station.)

M/S/P to recommend approval of the (modified) Program Review of the Department of Mass Communication and continuation of the program with modifications relating to the planned merger with Speech Communication. (Ayes 6, nays 0)

Carol Becker will draft CAPR's report. Mass Communication will be scheduled for a full review in 2003-2004, in conjunction with Speech Communication.

7. Lecturers' Perspective of Tenure Track Hiring Process:
Felix Herndon spoke to CAPR about issues relating to the hiring of lecturers versus tenure-track faculty. He expressed concern that because lecturers are cheaper to hire for a number of reasons, the University has the financial incentive to hire more lecturers rather than filling or creating tenure-track positions. Lecturers are cheaper to hire in part because they are not paid for advising students, whereas tenure-track faculty receive 3/15 salary for this. The form used by the Deans in prioritizing tenure-track hires, and included by CAPR as an appendix to the Policies and Procedures for Five Year Reviews and Plans, does not mention this 3/15 difference in calculating FTES. In response to a question, Herndon said that lecturers strongly favor tenure-track positions over lecturers' positions in the expectation that they would qualify for tenure-track openings. He suggested that 1) CAPR address the issue of hiring more tenure-track faculty relative to lecturers and discuss the cost issues involved in its BEC-6 report and 2) CAPR could consider suggesting changes to the way FTES is calculated.

Although a formal vote was not taken (pending the preparation of the BEC-6 report) there was clear consensus that CAPR would not recommend hiring more lecturers relative to tenure-track faculty due to the cost differentials. CAPR further responded that they do not believe that they control the way FTES is calculated. However, Emily Stoper has informed Jane Lopus that she plans to discuss the possibility of inserting an item regarding the three units allocated to student advising under "Cost Factors" on the deans form.

8. Review of Reports of Tenure-Track Requests from the Four Schools:
CAPR received reports at the meeting from the School of Science, the School of Education and Allied Studies, the School of Arts, Letters and Sciences, and the University Library on tenure track position
requests for 2001-2002. The School of Business and Economics submitted a memorandum stating that they are not requesting authorization for any tenure track position searches in 2001-2002. 98-99 BEC 6, as amended, requests that these reports be sent to CAPR by April 15, and charges CAPR with "forwarding its observations" on the reports to the Academic Senate. Materials must be submitted to the Senate by May 15, 2001 in order for the Senate to act on them this year.

A discussion was held on the nature of the observations that CAPR could make given this time frame. It was decided that everyone would try to record their observations and send them by April 26 to Jane Lopus, who would then compile the notes and distribute them together. Alternatively, some CAPR members may send their observations via email directly to the rest of the committee. CAPR plans to finalize the report of its observations at its meeting on May 3.

In this context, it was observed that the current duties and time line for CAPR might pose an unrealistic burden on the committee during Spring Quarters. There are approximately fifty-one programs to be reviewed, meaning that an average of ten should submit program reviews to CAPR each Spring Quarter. CAPR would then need to meet with ten program chairs, discuss the five-year reviews, and write and approve ten reports. In addition to this, pursuant to 98-99 BEC 6, CAPR is charged with completing a report on their observations on prioritizations of tenure tract hires during Spring Quarter.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Lopus, Acting Secretary