Minutes of the Meeting of February 7, 2002

Members Present: Carol Becker- Chair, Margaret Desmond, Beverly Dixon, Jennifer Eagan, Leo Kahane, Michael Lee, Bijan Mashaw, and Michael Strait

Members Absent: Carol Castagnozzi, Frank Martino- Provost, and Eric Suess

Guests: John Hammerback

The meeting was called to order by Chair Becker at 2:06 PM in the President's Conference Room.

Approval of Agenda: M/S/P

Approval of the minutes of the meeting of January 17, 2002: M/S/P

Report of the Chair:
The committee raised the issue of whether or not CAPR needs to write separate reports on departments asked to report back to CAPR or if the record in the minutes is sufficient. Chair Becker will check on this procedural question with Connie.

Chair Becker informed CAPR that Chemistry and Biochemistry will postpone their report back to CAPR until March 7. Chair Becker wrote to the chair of the Psychology Department with a reminder that the department is scheduled to report back to CAPR on February 21, but has received no response yet.

Chair Becker received a message from Carl Bellone indicating if a major has more than the minimum 180-unit requirement, then the department is required to provide justification for this within the self-study section of their Five-Year Review. This seems to be important to the Chancellor’s office, perhaps concerning the upcoming WASC review.

Margaret Desmond volunteered to write the CAPR report for the Department of Ethnic Studies’ Five-Year Review.

Winter enrollments are up 7%. This is a record high for CSUH, and the university hopes to see more money as a result.

Leone Nidiffer e-mailed Chair Becker the URL of the website where all of the tables for the statistical data needed for Five-Year Reviews appear. The website is:
Chair Becker reported on the recent Executive Committee meeting where members, including President Rees and Provost Martino, discussed the 00-01 CAPR 10 document. The overriding faculty concern is that faculty have input beyond their individual schools. The Executive Committee is forming a task force to address this issue by interfacing the following five resources: BEC 6, the Committee A report, 00-01 CAPR 10, University-wide criteria, and the Dean’s criteria. The task force’s job will be to make the criteria and process for tenure-track allocations explicit and consistent, and to assist in making the thinking behind the decisions on new tenure-track allocations publicly understandable. The on-going dialogue between faculty and administration is needed to make this possible. CAPR needs to consider the question of whether a twelfth principle is needed stating that the Five-Year Program should play an important role in the process. As of now, there is no formal process stating that the Deans must address issues stemming from the Five-Year Program Reviews in their tenure-track allocation recommendations. The task force would like a representative from CAPR who will be a continuing member next year. Leo Kahane was unanimously voted to be CAPR’s representative to the task force. **M/S/P**

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

Request from the English Department for postponement of Five-Year Program Review: The Department of English has requested a one-year extension of their Five-Year Program Review due to illness in Chair Marilyn Silva’s family. She was taking a leadership role in their Five-Year Review process. A motion to ask the Department of English to submit their Five-Year Program Review in time to report to CAPR by the end of Fall 2002 passed unanimously. **M/S/P**

Mass Communication and Speech Communication Merger: John Hammerback from Mass Communication visited CAPR to discuss the merger of the Mass Communication and Speech Communication departments. He reported that all members of both departments voted to merge, and are now enthusiastic about the merger. Most concerns that faculty members had about merging have been addressed. The two departments had a retreat and a social gathering to get to know each other and to make plans for the new Department of Communication.

The new department will have nine regular faculty members, with one in Speech Communication and a search for another position in Speech Communication in progress. The new department will have 3 1.0 lecturers and plenty of part-time faculty. Some faculty who were opposed to the merger have since retired; the others have been won over to the idea. These objections were due to local circumstances, not because of any claim that the departments do not belong together.

The merger will enhance the efficiency of the department, merging overlapping areas of curriculum, creating opportunities for joint research and discussion of common interests. Courses are easily redesigned to accommodate students from each current department.
The new department can share physical resources to enhance both options. Office space and the moving process are the biggest obstacles to the merger. The degree modifications are in place. A joint six-course core curriculum has been established. These include two skills courses, Communication Theory, Communication Research, History of Communication, and a Seminar. The Mass Communication options will stay roughly the same, with the new core replacing some current courses. Speech Communication is reducing their options from five to three. They are dropping the Intercultural Communication and Speech Communication options, while keeping Organization Communication, Interpersonal Communication, and Public Communication. The merger reflects nation-wide trends in the field of Communication. CAPR unanimously approved the merger of the Mass Communication and Speech Communication departments into the Department of Communication.

CAPR’s interface with the Assessment Council regarding the role of assessment in the Five-Year Program Review:
The Assessment Council is seeking input from faculty and is asking for representatives from CIC and CAPR. The Executive Committee is expected to ask CIC and CAPR to include outcomes assessment in curricular issues and program reviews, as well as to provide liaisons to be members of the Assessment Council. CAPR discussed the pros and cons of CAPR’s involvement in assessment. Assessment documents are included in Five-Year Reviews, but otherwise assessment is done at the department level. It may be inappropriate for CAPR to be a committee that oversees the assessment process. However, there are several disconnected processes that faculty are engaged in that should come together so that they are not duplicated. The assessment process should perhaps be tied to program evaluation and resource allocation. In contrast, these issues may best be kept at the department level, since departments are responsible for faculty and curricular issues. Perhaps there should be a faculty representative from each school to give input to the Assessment Council. Since assessment plans are not yet fully in place, perhaps the committee’s involvement is premature. CAPR will consider its role in assessment further.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:51 PM.

Submitted by,
Jennifer Eagan, Secretary