Minutes of the Meeting of February 19, 2004

Members Present: Judy Clarence, Susan Gubernat, Jiansheng Guo, Janet Patterson, Michael Strait (Chair)

Members Absent: Kevin Callahan, Vish Hegde, Chris Lubwama, Juan Robles, Gloria M. Rodriguez, Gale Young

Chair Strait called the meeting to order at 2:12 p.m. He noted that we lacked a quorum without which we cannot vote.

1. Approval of the Agenda
   The Agenda was accepted, with an addition (item 5) by Guo, who wished to comment on the Library Advisory Committee meeting he attended.

   The group was puzzled by the inclusion of the 12/4/03 Minutes on this agenda, feeling that they have already been approved. Strait will investigate.
   The Minutes of the February 5 meeting were approved as submitted.

3. Report of the Chair
   Not all the people invited to CAPR meeting to discuss the discontinuance of the Arts Administration program have responded. Strait hopes they’ll attend either the March 4 or March 18 meeting. Strait is scheduled to participate in a conference on March 4, so Secretary Clarence will chair the meeting, and Gubernat will take minutes. If Arts Administration people cannot attend the March 4 meeting, we’ll continue today’s discussions.
   Concerning the Review Schedule, Strait reported that the Masters in Taxation does indeed belong on the list as a separate degree program reviewed independently from the MBA [It is underlined, meaning it has Outside Accreditation and therefore is under the requirements of 02-03 CAPR 1].
   Gubernat asked if CAPR will be swamped with reviews this spring; Strait responded that the workload looks reasonable because some programs are on different cycles, and some, such as Business Administration, will undergo outside accreditation. Liberal Studies has asked for postponement, and Telecommunication Systems will be reviewed next year along with Computer Sciences.

4. Report of the Presidential appointee
   No report.

5. Discussion of the Library Advisory Committee Meeting 2/19/04
   Library Advisory Committee member Guo announced that, according to University Librarian Myoung-ja Lee Kwon, the Library faces a budget reduction of anywhere from 8.3% to 15%, mandated by the Provost, during the next academic year. Cuts of this severity will most likely result in reduction in service hours and/or in Library acquisitions. Because the Library’s staffing is the lowest in the CSU system, Library staff cannot be cut further. Guo is concerned about the effect these cuts will have on academic programs, and requested that CAPR make a statement of concern to Ex Comm. Discussion focused on whether or not such a statement would be an appropriate action for CAPR to undertake. Strait observed that, although CAPR’s focus since the advent of COBRA seems to have narrowed to processing program reviews and influencing the tenure-track allocation process, we shouldn’t lose sight of our broader focus of reviewing the overall CSUH academic plan. The campus has consistently treated the Library as a College, so it is appropriate for CAPR to look at Library issues. Gubernat will create a draft statement for CAPR members to review and vote on via email requesting that the Academic Senate put this issue on the agenda of its next meeting.
6. Work Group Updates

Strait outlined the four issues CAPR must address this year:

- **Outcomes Assessment**
  
  We need to provide more guidance on this issue within program review.

- **Academic Standards**
  
  A Senate survey was conducted on this subject a couple of years ago. Data were collected and analyzed, and a subcommittee of Ex Com came up with recommendations and an action plan to which Senate committees were to respond. CAPR responded with a recommendation concerning GPA and grades, but it was rejected by the Senate. So we asked the Senate Chair to give us a new charge, which we received in November. In order to proceed, we need to review the minutes of last year’s meetings in which this issue was discussed. Gubernat asked why this is coming back to us, and why it was rejected by the Senate. Are academic standards truly eroding? Was the GPA issue given too much importance? Gubernat observed that faculty’s academic standards are available on individual syllabi. She further observed that in Senate people were defensive, and that perhaps we should avoid mention of GPA. Strait responded that the issue originated with the perception that lecturers, in a less powerful position than tenure-track faculty, were under greater pressure from students to give higher grades, and that support for maintaining high academic standards needs to be given irrespective of faculty status. Guo suggested that instead of trying to devise wording that will pass in Senate, we should gather opinions about how academic standards can be improved. A discussion on this issue could take place in Senate; other faculty could be encouraged to give input as well. Strait concurred.

- **Review Procedures and Evaluation Criteria**
  
  The document *CAPR 7* outlines the process for the construction and processing of program reviews, but it doesn’t give guidance on how to conduct a review once program documents have been received. Earlier this year Strait created a “protocol” document and mechanism for a formal follow-up discussion with the chair, dean and provost so that a review includes an action plan, issues which the current *CAPR 7* doesn’t address. Strait observed that a 2/7/94 document, official until the creation of *CAPR 7*, included procedures that are omitted in the newer document. He suggested that we examine and re-package *CAPR 7*, incorporating sections of the earlier document, so we have a single, coherent set of procedures.

- **Tenure Track Resource Allocation**
  
  Our influence in this area has been reduced to some extent by COBRA. But Strait observed that CAPR does need to fashion the review process so that a reviewed program makes its strongest possible case for needed tenure-track faculty. Again, this process would include a formal follow-up discussion in which dean, chair and provost consider action plans and tenure-track needs.

  Strait drew the committee’s attention to the document *Guide to Regular Tenure Track Hiring* and suggested we consider as an attachment to our policies and procedures an analysis of the correlation between CAPR Policies and Procedures and the *Guide*, which appears on the Senate website.

  Strait then demonstrated the discussion forums he’s set up on Blackboard for the four work groups.

  Guo suggested that each work group be given a slot on the agenda of an upcoming meeting. At the next meeting he will lead a discussion of Tenure Track Resource Allocation.

  Strait distributed copies of *Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan Rubric for Reviewers*, a document we might want to adapt for our use. He also passed out copies of *Standard 2: Achieving Education Objectives Through Core Functions* from the WASC Handbook of Accreditation/2001, and *System-defined Institutional Accountability Indicators* from the CSU.

The meeting adjourned at 4:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Clarence