CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCES

Approved as presented

Minutes of the Meeting of January 17, 2002

Members Present: Carol Becker- Chair, Margaret Desmond, Beverly Dixon, Jennifer Eagan, Frank Martino- Provost, Bijan Mashaw, Michael Strait, and Eric Suess

Members Absent: Carol Castagnozzi and Leo Kahane

Guests: President Norma Rees, Brenda Bailey, and Bette Felton

The meeting was called to order by Chair Becker at 2:14 PM in the Library Conference Room.

Approval of Agenda: M/S/P

Approval of the minutes of the meeting of December 6, 2001: M/S/P

Report of the Chair:
CAPR’s recommendation to place the Master of Social Work program in the University’s Master Plan is going forward to the Academic Senate, accompanied by a memo from Chair Becker and other supporting documents. The Academic Senate will discuss this issue and vote this Tuesday, January 22. Provost Martino asked if Mary diSibio’s comments would be included in these supporting documents. Chair Becker replied that she had asked Ex Comm to include a statement from Mary diSibio in the packet of information for the Academic Senate and they had agreed to do so. diSibio is likely to address the Senate herself. As Chair Becker understands her concerns, diSibio was objecting that the wording in the program proposal is oriented towards mental health and not to vulnerable populations and community programs. This can be seen to overlap with the function of the Masters in Educational Psychology that can lead to a license in Marriage and Family Therapy. Terry Jones met with Chair Becker over these concerns. She urged him to show that he understands the issues that diSibio is bringing up and to work with her to resolve them. Margaret Desmond understood diSibio’s concerns to be that MFT professionals could indeed get the same jobs that MSW professionals would get. Chair Becker noted that this is reflective of a traditional turf battle between these two fields.

Chair Becker handed out a meeting schedule for the 2002 Winter and Spring quarters. Sociology informed Chair Becker that they wanted a delay in submitting their Five-Year Review document to CAPR because all of the performance review statistics that they need would not be available in time. Hopefully all departments will submit their Five-Year Review documents by the March 1 deadline, but some will probably come in late.
Chair Becker clarified the nature of CAPR’s reports in response to the Five-Year Review documents and asked for volunteers to write the reports for upcoming Reviews. Beverly Dixon will write the report for Chemistry/Biochemistry. Eric Suess will write the report for Economics. Margaret Desmond will write the report for English. Bijan Mashaw will write the report for Sociology, and Chair Becker will write the report for Philosophy.

Report of the Vice President, Academic Affairs:
Provost Martino had no report but offered to answer any questions that committee members might have. Chair Becker asked about current enrollment figures, which President Rees had provided at a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. Fall FTES are up about 4.1% over last year’s numbers, and Winter FTES are up about 3.7% from last year. Freshman enrollments have not gone up.

Discussion of 00-01 CAPR 10 and the Action Items approved by the Academic Senate on May 29, 2001:
Chair Becker asked President Rees to comment on why she acknowledged, but did not approve, 00-01 CAPR 10 and the Action Items that address CAPR’s role in the review of tenure track hiring requests. President Rees wants to hear from CAPR committee members on this issue. She indicated that the problem with the document is that the task of CAPR remains vague. She asked how the Action Items are to be accomplished. There are three existing documents that address this issue. Some lay out principles; others deal with the process. President Rees indicated that the principles are fine, and that she is glad to see the role of the Five-Year Review back in the process. However, the process and procedures remain unclear. The three documents are: A Guide to Regular (Tenure-Track) Faculty Hiring at California State University, Hayward 2000-2005, a.k.a. the Committee A Report (which is not a guide, but a set of principles and concepts), BEC 6 (which lays out guidelines for faculty participation), and 00-01 CAPR 10 Observations on Tenure-Track Allocation Requests for 2001-2002. President Rees stated that she had a hard time trying to see how these three documents fit together. There is a timing problem with the process. CAPR doesn’t have time to submit its report to the Provost and the President in time for its report to be a meaningful part of the process. Deans are asked to inform departments about tenure-track hires for the next year in April. How can CAPR finish its report that quickly?

Chair Becker stated that Deans and Chairs discuss tenure-track requests before they are prioritized. CAPR looks at the requests once they are prioritized by the Deans, then CAPR formulates its observations. CAPR’s report can be available on time if Deans get their reports to the committee when the Provost has indicated. Provost Martino asked about the nature of CAPR’s observations. Last year, CAPR was critical of the Deans’ reports and made observations about the process, but did not give input that could help the President in her decision-making. President Rees observed that CAPR will not make specific recommendations in the form of ranking tenure-track requests itself, but if it does not, then what can an active role be?

Chair Becker added that the new principle indicated in 00-01 CAPR 10 is that the Five-Year Review process should have an impact in tenure-track hiring. CAPR is the only
committee that oversees all of the Five-Year Reviews, so naturally we have the task of linking the Reviews to the tenure-track hiring process. President Rees acknowledged that CAPR’s new standard format for the Five-Year Review reflected progress. But outside reviewers almost always claim that departments need new tenure-track faculty, and they’re probably right. But, how will CAPR distinguish the value of these claims? Chair Becker said that of course all departments want more resources, and CAPR is limited because it does not see all the Five-Year Reviews at the same time. President Rees stated that she would like instruction on what she should be paying attention to in determining new tenure-track hires. She would like to get faculty input in such a way that she would be able to use it and clearly understand it.

President Rees asked who develops the prioritization criteria that the Deans use in their reports to CAPR. Chair Becker responded that most Deans did not indicate how he/ she came to his/ her prioritization. The Deans may have used the same criteria, but they were not made available to CAPR. Provost Martino claimed that there is a university-wide set of criteria implicit in existing documents. President Rees questioned other issues in the Action Items of 00-01 CAPR 10. She and Provost Martino clarified that a separation does not mean that a department is owed a new tenure-track hire. The wording in the document makes it seem like this used to be the case. President Rees also noted that the document states that the continued success of programs is to be a priority; this makes it seem like old programs would be given preference over newer programs. Lastly, she said that maintaining an overall number of tenure-track hires and a certain student-professor ratio is a goal, but cannot be guaranteed due to budget constraints. Budget issues are best addressed with an eye to the big picture, not when focused on specific issues. President Rees concluded her remarks by encouraging CAPR to take an active role in resource allocation, including tenure-track hires.

Progress report by the Department of Nursing and Health Sciences on the program modifications of the Health Sciences Program (CAPR’s requested follow up to the 2000-01 Health Sciences Five-Year Program Review):
Bette Felton and Brenda Bailey returned to CAPR to discuss new developments in their Health Sciences program since the time of their Five-Year Review last year. The four new options that they had planned to implement had all been passed through committee and will be in the 2002-03 catalogue. The options are designed to be an integral part of the major and to focus students on certain career options, rather than a loose collection of electives. The new options are: Administration, Community Health Education, Pre-professional Preparation, and Environmental Health/ Safety. The Community Health Education option is linked to community college classes at Chabot and other 2-year colleges. This option has changed as a result of research done by the department. The Health Science teaching credential did not prove to be a viable option due to changes in staffing and curriculum in K-12. Students taking this option are training for the CHES exam, a national certification to become a Community Health Educator. There is a course proposal to link this option with a Peer Health Educator program through the Student Health Center on campus. The department will continue to advance its Environmental Health/ Safety option. Although there are jobs available in this field, students have not shown much interest.
CAPR asked if the options were designed to give students career direction. Bette Felton answered affirmatively. The touchstone class is designed to present the array of career options to majors, and the capstone course is developed so that students could focus on job and internship searches. The department will work with Environmental Sciences to continue to develop their curriculum. Beverly Dixon suggested that the department offer a course in Health Education for biology credential track students. The loss of Bette Felton to administration hurts the department, and Brenda Bailey is discussing how to fill the gap with Dean Leung. The department is also in contact with Berkeley to find temporary faculty. Chair Becker noted that the date of the next review was not included on the Health Sciences Five-Year Review report. The committee will note that Health Sciences next review will take place in four years (05-06).

Discussion of Annual Performance Review Statistics
(http://www.aba.cshayward.edu/IRA) and 00-01 CAPR 7 Appendix (CAPR Five-Year Review Statistics):
Carol Becker, Eric Suess, and Michael Strait met with John Charles and Lee Thompson about resolving inconsistencies in the performance review statistics. The Central Management System is developing a system to integrate information for the whole CSU system, but this will not be fully integrated until 2005. Provost Martino stated that the systems already in place should be adequate to get any information that CAPR would need or request from departments. Chair Becker noted that we have different forms with some overlap. Eric Suess said that the problem is that departments get information from the Deans and Data Warehouse, but the numbers are interpreted differently, and so they are changed or inconsistent. Departments then choose how they present what they get from different sources. Provost Martino stated that no uniform source would change the fact that there is no consensus as to what the terms really mean. The Deans’ numbers are becoming increasingly consistent, so departments should be using those. Eric Suess asked if PeopleSoft could help us normalize the data. Provost Martino stated that CAPR can request the statistics if they are not included in the Five-Year Review document, because they are readily available from Data Warehouse or Institutional Research. Departments already do this when they request tenure-track hires; the Dean’s from should be adequate.

Discussion of CAPR’s interface with the Assessment Council regarding the role of assessment in the Five-Year Program Review:
The Executive Committee would like the Chairs of CAPR and CIC to meet with the Chair of the Assessment Council to address how to develop a closer working relationship between the Assessment Council and each committee. The Assessment Council also seems to want these committees to encourage faculty participation in Assessment at the department level. Chair Becker will attend the Assessment Council meeting on January 30th. Members of the committee can think about this issue for the next meeting on February 7.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 PM.

Submitted by,

Jennifer Eagan, Secretary