Members Present: Carol Castagnozzi, Margaret Desmond, Beverly Dixon, Susan Gubernat, Chair Michael Lee, Provost Frank Martino, Steve Peng, Michael Strait, Assim Sagahyroon AS representative Jack Wu
Members Absent: Chris Lubwama
Guests: Emily Brizendine, Phil Duren, Jean Easterly, Dean Arthurlene Towner

The meeting was called to order by Chair Lee at 2:05 P.M.

1. Approval of the Agenda
   The agenda was approved. M/S/P.

2. Approval of the Minutes
   The minutes of the November 21, 2002 meeting were approved. M/S/P.

3. Report of the Chair
   Chair Lee informed CAPR that although it would seem that the current budget crisis in Sacramento will be quite hard on the CSU, the implications for academic planning and resources are unclear at this time. He hoped that Provost Martino would address this issue to CAPR.

   Chair Lee reminded CAPR that there would be a continuation of the discussion at the last meeting (Nov. 21), regarding the issue of CAPR’s requirements in terms of five-year review reports for those programs with outside accreditation.

   Chair Lee reported that CAPR must continue its discussion regarding academic standards and the five-year review process. The Academic Senate has requested that CAPR provide language that articulates a policy on this issue.

   Chair Lee reported on the status of five-year reviews that are due this year. Spanish and French have submitted drafts of their self-studies and five-year plans. Kinesiology, Recreation, and Political Science have submitted notifications that their self-studies and five-year plans are almost finished. No notification has been received from Anthropology and Criminal Justice. The other programs due this year (Counseling, Education, Educational Psychology, Educational Leadership, and Special Education) are awaiting our decision regarding the requirements for programs with outside accreditation. The Chair of CAPR has received notification from Geography and Environmental Studies that at the February 6th meeting, they make a formal request for an extension. Chair Lee has not heard from the English Department regarding the status of their postponed review. He will contact that Department and to inquire whether there is anything that CAPR might do to help them.

   Chair Lee reported that the Chancellor’s office is making some suggestions to the Academic Senate with respect to the requirements for program reviews and whether they might
be undertaken at longer intervals than five-year. Next meeting, Chair Lee will report any information that is available.

In December, Chair Lee represented CAPR at the memorial service for Connie Sexauer. He reported that the service was a wonderful celebration of her life, her achievements, and her beliefs. The service was well attended by CSUH faculty and staff and a clear demonstration of the high regard in which she was held by the CSUH community.

4. Report of the Vice-President, Academic Affairs

No formal report. Provost Martino commented on the influence of the Governor’s budget on CSU. He believes that the Governor’s budget is the best that the CSU can expect. If the CSU has a student fee increase, the overall budget will still be lower than last year’s budget. He reported that this year we are proceeding with our hiring process for tenure-track faculty, and we have left our curriculum untouched. He does not believe that we will decrease our student enrollment; however, we might have cuts in other areas

5. Continuation of the discussion of reporting requirements for programs with outside accreditation.

Chair Lee reminded CAPR that at the November 21 meeting, the following four options were considered for addressing the issue of reporting requirements for programs with outside accreditation:

a. All programs submit documents in the format detailed in 00-01 CAPR 7, and CAPR make its recommendations accordingly;

b. Outside accredited programs submit their accreditation documentation to CAPR, in some suitable format (that would account for confidentiality issue and so forth), with a bridging document that explains how and where CAPR can find the information required of programs with additions as necessary, and CAPR make its recommendation accordingly;

c. Outside accredited programs submit their accreditation approval to CAPR, and CAPR would immediately issue a recommendation to continue the program without modification;

d. Outside accredited programs submit their accreditation approval to CAPR. CAPR would immediately issue a recommendation to continue the program without modification, with the additional requirement that appropriate data be provided as detailed by the Academic Senate in a forthcoming addendum to 00-01 CAPR 7. CAPR would review this data for completeness.

Chair Lee noted that there was little difference between options 3 and 4 because the Deans must submit that data every year when they submit their requests for new tenure-track positions. Dean Towner reported that option 3 was the preferred option; however, if option 4 is chosen that would be acceptable. Associate Dean Brizendine reported that CEAS presents that data on an annual basis. Assistant Dean Easterly stated that the rigor of the accreditation report requires learning outcomes much the same as required for the CAPR report. Chair Duren reported that when the Colleges submit their tenure-track requests, they always submit the statistics required by CAPR. A discussion followed regarding the role of CAPR if the accreditation report is accepted as fulfilling the five-year review.

A motion was made to accept option #4; however, there was no second. The motion was tabled.

A motion was made to accept option #3 which is stated as the following:
Outside accredited programs will submit their accreditation approval to CAPR, and CAPR will immediately issue a recommendation to the Academic Senate to continue the program without modification. M/S/P.

One member, AS Representative Jack Wu, voted against the motion.

6. Continuation of discussion of Academic Standards and the Five-Year Review process.

Chair Lee reminded CAPR that the Academic Senate requested CAPR to write language that would require departments and programs to report on their grading, GPAs and their approaches to maintaining academic standards. After some discussion regarding the degree to which an assessment of grading policies and academic standards might infringe upon academic freedom, the motion was made that the following language be inserted as item 4 in Document #1: Self-Study, 00-01 CAPR 7 and renumber subsequent items on the list:

Attach a summary of the program’s procedures for assessing faculty grading practices and standards. Include a report and analysis of the program’s annual average GPA for all courses in the major and for the major as a whole for the last five years and a list of measures adopted if necessary and as appropriate, to uphold academic standards (See Academic Senate Academic Standards Report May 14, 2001 for a complete listing of concerns to be addressed.). M/S/P.

7. Discussion of Philosophy Department Five-Year Review

Based on discussions led by CAPR’s designated reviewer, Michael Strait, the five-year review submitted by the Philosophy Department did not appear to conform to some of the guidelines specified by 00-01 CAPR 7. CAPR charged Michael Strait to prepare a response from the Committee reflecting the following and will consider appropriate actions to address these concerns:

a. A summary of the last five-year plan was absent in Document #1, Self-Study (See #1 under Document #1: Self-Study).

b. The program’s outcome assessment within Document #1, Self-Study. (See #3 under Document #1: Self-Study).

c. According to CAPR 7, programs are expected to revise their five-year plan to reflect outside reviewer’s comments and the departmental response. This step was missing.

Strait’s draft response will be reviewed at the next CAPR meeting.

8. Adjournment

The motion was made to table agenda item #8 until the next meeting. M/S/P

The motion was made to adjourn the meeting. M/S/P

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55.

The next meeting of CAPR will be held February 6, 2003.

Respectfully submitted by,

Margaret Desmond, Secretary