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

Members Absent: Beverly Dixon, Frank Martino- Provost

Guests: Diane Beeson, Carl Bellone, Terry Jones, David Larsen, Michael Lee, Dianne Rush-Woods, and Gale Young

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 November 1, 2001: M/S/P, with minor changes

Report of the Chair:
CAPR’s report on the Department of Human Development’s Five-Year Review has passed in the academic senate. Emily Stoper and Don Wort have noted that the 00-01 CAPR 10 Action Items still need to be acted upon. As Senate Chair, Don should find out why the President only acknowledged and did not approve the document. CAPR is hoping for clarification on this, as 00-01 CAPR 10 is a work in progress.

Document 01-02 CAPR 1 was discussed in the Executive Committee, and was approved by a 5-4 vote. A concern was raised that perhaps the CAPR chair should not take responsibility for getting the CAPR report back to department chairs; the Academic Senate should do this. Another concern discussed was the omission of the standing subcommittees. If these committees don’t exist, then what is CAPR’s role? Faculty voice in resource allocation will be a future agenda item for the Executive Committee.

A report from the Provost indicated that CSUH will enact a 1% budget cut. This cut will not affect courses or salaries, but could lead to a 4% reduction of the general fund. There is a hiring freeze in effect for staff positions, but not for tenure track hires. The President will try to protect tenure-track searches. Enrollments are at an all-time high. Of course, CSUH will want to retain these.

Report of the Vice President, Academic Affairs: Absent, no report.

Discussion of CAPR’s role in the annual tenure-track faculty allocation requests process: Tabled until the next meeting of CAPR on December 6.
Request from Department of Geography & Environmental Studies for postponement of Five-Year Program Review:

David Larsen and Michael Lee from Geography and Environmental Studies visited CAPR to explain their request for a postponement of their Five-Year Program Review. Their last review from spring 1997 emphasized the Five-Year Plan for the future of the department. The department at that time was in transition, with only Professors Larsen and Eder remaining. At that time, the department held the following assumptions: 1) it would have five years to implement the plan, 2) the chair would have more time to work on the plan, and 3) the department would hire new faculty as soon as planned. Right now, the department is involved in curricular changes in Environmental Studies. Many changes are being made and some options are being dropped in order to make the program more focused. Now all of the resources and faculty are in place to finish the terms of the plan. Leigh Mintz assured the department at the time of the last review that they would have time to implement this plan before the next Five-Year Program Review. The department would like their next outside reviewer to be able to look ahead. Also, the department does not want to duplicate elements of the plan that coincide with assessment.

Carol Castagnozzi asked if these elements of the plan aren’t always in process to refine, improve, and respond to outside challenges. Eric Suess asked if postponing the Five-Year Review until next year would pressure the department to complete the work already in progress. Chair Becker asked how their situation was different from any department conducting a Five-Year Review. David Larsen replied that the difference in their situation is the presence of new faculty to accomplish the elements of the plan. The faculty could better use their time completing the changes in the plan, rather than conducting a Five-Year Review.

Chair Becker noted that the new policies and procedures for conducting the Five-Year Review are more structured. David Larsen said that the department would be able to meet the timetable for next year. Mary Timney stated that CAPR worked hard last year trying to revise and standardize the schedule for Five-Year Reviews, and that departments should be ready to conduct Five-Year Reviews every five years, in spite of promises from administrators. Chair Becker enumerated three options for CAPR to exercise regarding Geography and Environmental Studies’ request for postponement: 1) grant postponement, but have the department conduct their next Five-Year Review five years from now (06-07), 2) grant the postponement and re-set the clock after the review next year, the subsequent review occurring in 07-08, or 3) ask that the department do a review this year.

Motion to grant Geography and Environmental Studies request for a 1-year extension to complete their Five-Year Review in 02-03 with the subsequent review in 06-07. M/S/P [9 yea, 0 no, 0 abstentions]

Request to place a Master of Social Work on the CSUH Academic Master Plan:

Guests Diane Beeson, Carl Bellone, Terry Jones, Dianne Rush-Woods, and Gale Young joined CAPR to discuss this request. Carl Bellone asked that this item be placed on CAPR’s agenda for this meeting. Chair Becker noted that CAPR should have gotten the Dean’s analysis first. Terry Jones said that he thought that the Dean’s analysis would come, since their proposal was unanimously approved by the Department of Sociology and Social Services and by ALSS. Professors Jones, Beeson, and Rush-Woods explained their case for the need for a MSW program at CSUH. There is a shortage of social workers, and CSUH has been asked by a
number of counties, including Alameda and Contra Costa, to start a MSW program. The distance learning program already in place in Contra Costa was the first response to this request. An MSW program would enhance the Social Services undergraduate program. Most of these students get jobs in social services, and they need master’s level training. Other area programs are at capacity and/ or too far away for our students. CSUH is currently working with the accrediting body to help create the program, which will be in accordance with the University’s mission statement.

Carl Bellone noted that they have experienced consultants and potential funding sources. Yes, the program looks expensive, but there are funds available. Once established, the program would be a fee for service training center, and could catch some of the work that Berkeley is too busy to do. Associate Dean Gale Young stated that ALSS is fully supportive of the MSW program. The Council of Chairs has discussed the proposal over e-mail, and there is reticent agreement that the MSW program should be placed on the University’s Master Plan. There was not time for the regular procedure, so this plan did not come before the ALSS Curriculum Committee, but this committee will discuss the proposal on Monday, November 19. Department Chairs will revisit the proposal at a future meeting as well. However Gale Young stated that she would like CAPR to start the process without the formal ALSS analysis.

Terry Jones noted that resource allocations would be debated. The approval for the Master Plan just acts as a placeholder for the department to pursue development of the program. Leo Kahane asked about the number of units for the MSW degree. Terry Jones replied that the number was typical of a 2-year professional program. Margaret Desmond asked if the 7000-level courses would be offered through the extension program. Diane Beeson said that no, the 7000-level designation simply indicates courses for the second-year of the program. Leo Kahane asked if the program would be able to accommodate our students, who often attend part-time and work. Terry Jones replied that the Council of Social Work demands that MSW programs begin as full-time. Students already employed by certain agencies will be eligible for an $18,000 stipend. Chair Becker asked what the anticipated numbers of students would be. Dianne Rush-Woods replied that Berkeley’s program admits about 110 and 95 attend each year. San Francisco State’s numbers are about the same. Both programs get more qualified applicants than they can admit. There are more than enough numbers of students and interest. Bijan Mashaw asked why this program wasn’t started earlier if there is this pressing need. Terry Jones cited officials in Contra Costa and Alameda counties who have been indicating the need for some time. They need social workers to assist clients in getting off of welfare, in light of recent welfare reform.

Bijan Mashaw asked about resources for the thirty new courses to be offered. Terry Jones explained that these courses would not be offered all at once. The department will need six faculty trained in social work to run the program, they will get three from a Title E grant for the first three years of the program. Carl Bellone explained that the FTES generated by the program will bring the funds. Mary Timney stated that resources are a zero-sum game, so we have to know who the resources will be taken from. Carl Bellone argued that these will be new students, and therefore will contribute to the overall good of the University. Mary Timney explained that there is not a one-to-one relation between FTES and funding, and that funds are not necessarily allocated to departments by the Dean based on FTES. Terry Jones argued that these issues will be discussed after the program is placed on the Master Plan. Carol Castagnozzi still expressed concern about available resources and feasibility in accordance with the policies for placing a program on the Master Plan. Terry Jones said that they need six faculty positions, three will be
provided by the grant, and the department could convert current positions to serve the MSW program. It would be a matter of shifting existing human resources.

Chair Becker asked how many students would be in the first class. Terry Jones replied 25-30. Bijan Mashaw said that he would like to see an implementation plan. Michael Straight noted that the program fits the University mission very well, and deserves support on principle. Leo Kahane stated that the need was clear, but what are the criteria for a program to be put on the Master Plan? Mary Timney noted that the need was likely, but often resources don’t show up and that tying the program to federal funding is dangerous. Two new faculty positions for the next year would constitute 20% of ALSS new faculty allocations, by the current year’s numbers. Terry Jones noted that putting the program on the Master Plan is to see if the program will work, and to see if it can secure funds. Diane Beeson reiterated the point that there are a lot of federal and state funds available, and that it is unlikely that they will dry up. Terry Jones stated that the way CSUH is perceived is dependent on this program. The legislature wants more social workers, so there will be questions as to how we can meet the need. The University decides how funds will be spent. How can we meet the need without the legislators dictating the need by earmarking funds? We have the opportunity to take control of this program and secure finding for it before that happens.

Chair Becker stated that CAPR does not have time to vote on this proposal today, but discussion will be on CAPR’s agenda for the meeting on December 6. Carl Bellone expressed urgency that this issue be addressed because the deadline for the proposal to go to the Chancellor’s Office with approval is January 15.

Discussion of Annual Performance Review Statistics (http://www.aba.csu Hayward.edu/IRA) and 00-01 CAPR 7 Appendix (CAPR Five-Year Review Statistics: Discussion postponed until next meeting on December 6.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 PM.

Submitted by,
Jennifer Eagan, Secretary