Minutes of the meeting of December 4, 2003

Members Present: Kevin Callahan, Judy Clarence, Susan Gubernat, Jiansheng Guo, Chris Lubwama, Gloria M. Rodriguez, Michael Strait (Chair), Gale Young (representative for Presidential Appointee), Helen Zong

Visitor: Laurie Price, Chair, Anthropology

Chair Strait called the meeting to order at 2:10.

1. Approval of the Agenda
   Callahan moved that the agenda be approved. M/S/P

2. Approval of the Minutes of November 6, 2003 and November 20, 2003
   Callahan moved to accept the minutes of November 6, with corrections as supplied by the chair and members of the committee. M/S/P
   Strait directed the committee members to offer all corrections to minutes of November 20 to the secretary via e-mail before December 15. After that date, the minutes of November 20 would be accepted by acclamation. Moved by Lubwama. M/S/P

3. Report of the Chair
   Strait reported that he anticipated that the student representative to CAPR would begin to attend meetings in January.
   Strait said he had received the proposal for the discontinuance of Arts Administration as well as Communications’ request for a modified review, and that he would circulate these for a vote in January.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   Young relayed the Provost’s response to the committee’s question about whether resource allocations made to graduate programs at CSUH were different from those made to undergraduate programs – a question that arose during the discussion of Anthropology’s Five-year Review presentation. The answer is that, system-wide, no distinction is made; FTE’s for both graduate and undergraduate programs are budgeted similarly. The legislature has never voted to make such a distinction. Further, the benefit of the higher fees charged for graduate credit redounds not to the department but to the university. Finally, there is as much variation in FTE’s among graduate programs as there is among undergraduate programs; some programs make more efficient use of their allocations.
   In this context, Callahan asked what plans were being made for the new doctoral program in Education, that is, did it have an impact on current resource allocations?
   Rodriguez reported that this was an Ed.D. in partnership with other institutions: SF State, San Jose State, UC Berkeley, and that besides the program’s reliance on external funding, the Education faculty were taking on further responsibilities as part of their workloads. In response to Clarence’s question about program size, Rodriguez noted that the first cohort of students would number 15; the second generation, 12.
   Guo asked if the Provost’s office could comment on what the university’s goals and policies for graduate programs might be. That is, what kind of support and incentives would the university provide to departments for the establishment or continuance of graduate programs?
Young replied that the Provost hadn’t addressed that aspect of the question, his underlying assumption being that of a decentralized organization. Thus, the questions that Guo raises are left up to the Deans of the individual colleges. Guo replied that if indeed its objective was 25% graduate enrollment, then the university is obliged to recognize the kind of increases in workload such graduate programs require. Is the Administration not doing its job, merely passing along what the state has allocated to the individual colleges? Can CAPR investigate this situation further? Strait suggested the issue of allocation of resources vis-à-vis graduate programs be included for discussion in the agenda of the CAPR work group that is considering tenure-track allocations. Callahan commented that if the Deans are “weighing” graduate programs differently, then from college to college there could be a disparity in the allocation of funds, and this could have a negative impact on undergraduate programs. Lubwama noted that this would be a difficult issue for CAPR to present to the University Senate since funding is distributed to colleges; and colleges, such as Business, often raise funds from outside the university. Guo questioned why it was faculty’s role to raise funds to support a system mandate for 25% graduate programs.

Young asked if it were within the purview of this committee to look at graduate programs, and if so, what models were available for assessing the quality of programs, independent of discipline. Strait replied that the five-year reviews CAPR is presented with are determined, at present, by which programs are degree-granting. He said that that may leave unresolved such questions as the differences, say, between the B.A. and the B.S. degree. He also suggested that a way for graduate programs to better represent their workloads through FTE’s would be to create courses for students who are not in a particular course but who require significant advisory time, the model being that of thesis units. Lubwama noted that creating coursework is the solution; it is courses that create FTE’s.

5. Continuing Discussion of the Anthropology Five-Year Review

As a point of information, Strait noted that the last item in the self-study still needs to address whether or not the department requires more than 180 units for graduation. Chair Price confirmed that the 180 units had been approved already by the department and that she would e-mail that confirmation to Strait.

Another suggestion Strait made was to avoid the argument of “replacing” a lost tenure-track faculty slot as a justification for a new line; each new tenure-track position needs to be justified on its own terms. Guo commented that a minor problem in the document is that the order of items does not conform to CAPR specifications. He added that the committee’s response to the five-year review is a positive one, and that CAPR should support the department’s request for the tenure-track position turned down last year. More specific information, he noted, is needed for the other three lines: FTE and SFR consequences as well as prioritization of requests. Also, there is no breakdown of lecturer SFR (keeping in mind the goal of 75/25). And does the proportion of 3000/4000-level courses reject the outside reviewer’s concerns?

Price agreed to send modifications to the five-year review, as suggested by CAPR, to Strait. Meanwhile, she asked the committee to consider her department’s new dilemma: she presented an addendum to the five-year report, dated December 2, detailing the Dean’s plan to transfer Anthropology’s current Administrative Support Coordinator, June Martin, to the Art Department in Winter 2004. The proposed plan is for the current Coordinator in the Criminal Justice Department to also cover the duties in the Anthropology Department. (See memo for details.) Students have signed a petition against this action, according to Price, because they realize how much front-line support they receive from Ms. Martin, whose formal job description defines that support as 50% of her responsibilities. Price said this loss of a dedicated support person will have an immediate and devastating effect on the day-to-day functioning of the department.
Rodriguez said she was in sympathy with the Anthropology Department’s plight, and asked if there were any clear standards (such as enrollment figures) used to determine how much staff support each program was allocated. She asked that this question be referred to the Provost. Young said that this is an issue appropriate also for WASC to consider in light of student services that support learning.

Strait raised the question: at what point in this process of asking for revisions in the Anthropology document should CAPR recommend that the program be continued? Guo replied that certainly there seemed no question of the program’s continuance. The discussion then turned to how the Anthropology Five-year Review might serve as a case-study for how CAPR can work with all departments in the future, aiding them in strengthening their profiles, particularly when seeking resources. Lubwama noted that it would be to the department’s advantage, as well, to make the strongest case possible; meanwhile, we shouldn’t hold up our recommendation.

In terms of modifications to the existing document: Strait reiterated the need to clarify the 180-unit question as well as to justify the discrepancy in enrollment data, that is, between the department’s figures and those of Institutional Research. Price asked if she could include both sets of data, and Strait agreed she was free to do so.

Strait asked all CAPR members to review the draft of the committee’s response, as written by Guo, on-line, and to send any questions or modifications to Guo eight days before the next meeting of the committee on January 15, 2004.

He asked the committee to join him in thanking Susan Gubernat for serving again as secretary this quarter; he reminded the committee that the position of secretary for Spring Quarter 2004 was still open. Judy Clarence will be taking on secretarial responsibilities in Winter 2004.

The meeting was adjourned at ____.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Gubernat