CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCES

Approved as presented

Minutes of the Meeting of October 18, 2001

Members Present: Carol Becker- Chair, Carol Castagnozzi, Margaret Desmond, Beverly Dixon, Jennifer Eagan, Leo Kahane, Frank Martino, Bijan Mashaw, Eric Suess, Michael Strait, and Mary Timney.

Members Absent: none

The meeting was called to order by Chair Becker at 2:03 PM in the President's Conference Room

Approval of Agenda: M/S/P

Approval of the minutes of the meeting of October 4, 2001: M/S/P
The minutes were approved with minor corrections. Jennifer Eagan will e-mail drafts of the minutes to CAPR members in advance of the next meeting.

Report of the Chair:
Chair Becker distributed a draft of CAPR=s meeting schedule for the academic year 01-02. Follow-up reports from Health Sciences and Chemistry/Biochemistry are scheduled for January 17. Psychology will present its follow-up report to CAPR on February 21. The distributed schedule tentatively reserves three meetings for the six up-coming Five-Year Reviews on March 7, April 4, and April 18. This will leave CAPR two or three meetings to consider allocation of tenure track requests. Chair Becker notes that this schedule is based on CAPR=s timetable from last year, and will likely change.

Frank Martino commented that the Deans should be ready to submit their Tenure Track Request Reports to CAPR at the beginning of Spring quarter. Chair Becker agreed that our consideration of the tenure track requests should take priority over Five-Year Reviews. If departments are scheduled to report to CAPR when these reports come in, CAPR will reschedule them accordingly.

Chair Becker will contact chairs of departments scheduled to conduct Five-Year Reviews to remind them of the need to secure an outside reviewer by November 1 and the need to secure a date to present their report to CAPR.

The concern was raised that perhaps trying to hear two reports in one meeting would be too much. Chair Becker indicated that we can probably do two reports in one meeting if we hold to a time limit and restrict extraneous comments. Our new form for Five-Year Reviews should help us streamline the process.

CAPR has contacted the President of the Student Association twice with no reply. Apparently, there is no
available student representative to CAPR.

Reporting on what happens to CAPR Five-Year Review Reports after they are approved by CAPR, Chair Becker explained that they are approved by the Academic Senate, and then sent to the President who acknowledges, approves, or does not approve them. The feedback policy stated in 00-01 CAPR 7 states that chairs are encouraged to meet with their Deans to discuss the Five-Year Review. However, completing the feedback loop is still an amorphous area that CAPR will continue to address.

CAPR revisited the suggestion that websites of the location CAPR documents appear on the paper versions. Due to the fact that the websites may become outdated, CAPR will not pursue this suggestion.

Report of the Vice President, Academic Affairs: No report.

Department of Engineering request to delay Five Year Review Program: CAPR approved a motion to grant the Department of Engineering a postponement of their Five-Year Review for two to three years so that it can coincide with their accreditation process. Their Five-Year Review clock will re-start at that time.
M/S/P [Yea 11, No 0, Abstentions 0]

Review of CAPR Policies and Procedures for Committee Operation:
Chair Becker handed out some proposed changes to CAPR Policies and Procedures document, which included two new items for duties of the chair and a revision of section (IV.) regarding subcommittees. These updates intend to reflect an updated definition of the role of CAPR. The elimination of the language regarding Standing Subcommittees is necessary because they do not exist and have not existed for some time on CAPR. CAPR’s role in allocating resources is changing, and there are now other University-wide committees, like the Budget Advisory Committee, who now fulfill some of CAPR’s old duties.

CAPR discussed the question of whether or not the review of tenure track allocations will be a permanent task of this committee and whether this role of CAPR should be indicated in the Policies and Procedures. This role is a work in progress. Even if the Academic Senate creates another committee to fulfill this function, as suggested by former Chair Lopus in CAPR’s 00-01 Year-End Report, it will not happen this year. CAPR members acknowledged that this task belongs in this committee because a new committee would have to duplicate CAPR’s work in reading Five-Year Review documents. Beverly Dixon suggested that an additional duty of the Chair should be to make sure that each department chair receive a copy of CAPR’s Five-Year Review reports for their department.

Chair Becker will bring a new working draft of the Policies and Procedures to the next meeting. She suggested that CAPR members read over the Policies and Procedures, as well as CAPR 10 plus the action items for our next meeting on November 1.

Bijan Mashaw suggested that the review of tenure track requests be enumerated as a duty of CAPR in the Policies and Procedures. He will collaborate with Eric Suess to create a draft of the language for the document.
Michael Strait asked what the schedule is for CAPR’s other enumerated duties, such as review of the University’s Master Plan. Frank Martino noted that review of the Master Plan hadn’t happened in recent memory.

Five Year Program Reviews: A. Format for CAPR’s response to Five Year Program Reviews: Chair Becker handed out a draft of the format for CAPR’s Five-Year Review reports. Indicated on this draft is an area for the recommendation of resources to be allocated for the department. CAPR Five-Year Review reports have been consistently recommending resources in these reports where there is a clear and present need. This serves to create a record for the big picture and for use in tenure track requests and allocations. Mary Timney recommended a running score care of these recommended resources for use in our evaluation of the Dean’s Tenure Track Request reports. CAPR will continue discussion of this issue at its next meeting.

Five Year Program Reviews: B. Discussion of CAPR Five Year Review statistics: Eric Suess presented some concerns about the forms that CAPR has attached to 00-01 CAPR 7 and how departments will fill them out in their Five-Year Reviews. CAPR uses the same form that the Deans use to evaluate tenure track requests, with some additional categories. The data needed to fill out this form comes from the Institutional Data Warehouse. Somehow the data from the warehouse doesn’t automatically fit into the Deans’ form and has to be re-typed. Not only does this create unnecessary work for Chairs and their secretaries, but also an increased potential for mistakes. Michael Strait agreed to look into this issue, to be revisited at CAPR’s next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 PM.

Submitted by,

Jennifer Eagan, Secretary