CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING & REVIEW

Minutes of the meeting of March 4, 2004

Members Present: Judy Clarence, Susan Gubernat, Jiansheng Guo, Vish Hegde, Chris Lubwama, Janet Patterson, Gloria M. Rodriguez, Gale Young (Presidential Appointee)
Members Absent: Kevin Callahan, Juan Robles, Michael Strait (Chair)
Visitor: Carl Bellone

Acting Chair Clarence called the meeting to order at 2:06.

1. Approval of the Agenda
   The agenda was rearranged to accommodate Carl Bellone’s visit to address the committee’s questions about Item 5: Special Majors Five-Year Review.

2. Approval of the Minutes
   As a clarification rather than a correction, Lubwama noted that in the Chair’s Report of the last meeting, as documented in the minutes, it was erroneously stated that the Masters in Taxation required its own separate five-year review; it does not.
   The minutes of February 19 were approved, as submitted. M/S/P (Rodriguez/Lubwama)

3. Special Majors Five-year Review: Carl Bellone
   Carl Bellone introduced the Special Majors Five-year Review with the caveat that no outside reviewer had been deemed necessary to complete the process, and that the Provost had agreed to this. He noted that he welcomed CAPR’s responses to the report and was at the meeting principally to hear the committee’s feedback and recommendations. He offered to provide as much information as necessary to address questions and concerns. Guo asked who was responsible for the program’s administration; Bellone replied that these duties take up a percentage of his own office’s responsibilities. He also clarified the role of faculty in the program: All three faculty members on a student’s committee must approve the degree program before a student pursues it, and that, once approved, a student was committed to that program and could not modify it on a whim. Guo noted that 36 units of upper-division coursework seemed low in comparison with other programs. Bellone acknowledged this was so. Gubernat asked if sample programs that students had devised in the past could be provided to help enrich the document; Bellone offered to send copies of such samples to Chair Strait, particularly examples from programs students had completed in Forensic Science, which has become a popular area for the special majors.

4. Report of the Chair
   Acting Chair Clarence said that she did not have the final tally for the vote taken via e-mail last week on the motion to bring CAPR’s concerns about cuts to the library allocation before the ExCom and the Senate. Strait will provide the final tally.
   Clarence verified that the committee would be meeting during finals week on March 18. She noted that the position of secretary for Spring 2004 was still vacant and that whoever was secretary was exempt, by definition, from preparing a written response to a five-year program review during the quarter he/she served. Clarence volunteered to be secretary in the spring if no one else wanted the position. She reiterated that the Library Director wanted to ensure that the library came up regularly for a five-year review, especially in light of the fact that library staff members are currently teaching four courses.
5. **Report of the Presidential Appointee**
   Gale Young said that Stan Clark, Acting Provost, has asked her to continue to represent the Provost’s office on this committee; she and Clark have scheduled regular meetings so she can update him.

6. **Special Majors Five-Year Review (continued)**
   The committee engaged in a preliminary, albeit lengthy, discussion of the program’s five-year document: preliminary, because without a representative of the program present for the discussion, the customary dialogue would have to be deferred to a future meeting; lengthy, because many members found much of the report to be atypical of a five-year review document, due, in part, to the *ad hoc* curricula, given the nature of such a program. Data such as SFRs cannot be gleaned; learning outcomes have apparently not been assessed; and while the program is closest in nature to Liberal Studies, it lacks a Director.

   Because of the committee’s varied and complex questions about how to treat this program review, it was decided that Carl Bellone be invited back to make a more formal presentation. (It wasn’t clear that he had been informed, prior to the meeting, of CAPR’s usual procedures.)

   Guo volunteered to be the main respondent and to write the committee’s report. He also offered to draft some key questions for Bellone’s consideration before the next meeting, and that he would post these for the committee’s immediate feedback via e-mail.

   Both Young and Lubwama noted that CAPR might best function in more of an advisory capacity, in Young’s words as “thinking partners” with Bellone in suggesting how best to present the five-year review. Guo said that an alternative was for the committee to acknowledge what is missing in the report, as it stands. Hegde raised the issues of finding models on other campuses to apply to the Special Majors program; and whether or not to still require an outside reviewer for the completion of the review. Young and Patterson pointed to the lack of historical data; Patterson suggested giving the program three more years to accumulate such data, and if such data are not available by then, to consider discontinuance, as an option.

7. **Workgroup Discussion of CAPR Role in Tenure-Track Allocation Process**
   Young asked what the current Senate documents say has changed, in light of the establishment of COBRA. Guo said that the role of CAPR vis a vis COBRA has not been alluded to; however, the route CAPR continues to take in reporting on program quality to the Senate would seem to indicate our continuing involvement. At present, the individual colleges have not been reporting their justifications to CAPR in light of their master plans, as required; nor has the university as a whole been required to justify tenure-track allocations to colleges based on the university’s own master plan. It appears that CAPR might still require reports on what are the academic, rather than the fiscal, criteria, being applied. Lubwama noted that budgetary decisions governing tenure-track allocations remain in the hands of the Deans and of COBRA, not CAPR, and thus our hands are tied. Guo countered that their decision-making does not necessarily take into account the issues of academic quality that five-year program reviews document when addressing tenure-track allocation requests. He said that CAPR is the place for faculty to ensure that tenure-track allocation recommendations to the President are based on quality; otherwise, faculty will have lost a voice in the process.

   The meeting was adjourned at 3:55.

   Respectfully submitted,
   Susan Gubernat
   Secretary, *pro tem*