CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY HAYWARD
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW

Minutes of the Meeting of June 3, 2004

Approved as presented

Members Present: Kevin Callahan, Judy Clarence, Susan Gubernat, Jiansheng Guo, Vish Hegde, Chris Lubwama, Michael Strait (Chair), Helen Zong.

Members Absent: Janet Patterson, Gloria M. Rodriguez, Gale Young

Chair Strait called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

1. Approval of agenda
   The agenda was approved, with a postponement of Item 6 until next year, and the addition of a brief report from the Campus Physical Planning Committee (Clarence).

   Minutes of the previous meeting will be sent via email for informal approval.

3. Report of the Chair
   Chair Strait plans to write a year-end report and send it to all members. He reminded us that any actions carried out at today’s meeting will take effect in Fall because Senate will not meet again this year. Julia Norton will be the 2004/05 Chair of CAPR.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   None.

5. Continued discussion of the Mass Comm/Speech Comm (now Communication Department) Five-Year Review (draft)
   Strait reminded the committee that we review programs, not departments. Thus the subject line of the draft review should be revised to read “New Communication Program’s Five-Year Review”. Unique circumstances surround this particular review, which deals with a new, combined department. Thus, the document before the committee is not a review of the past five years; it’s actually a plan for the next five years of this new program.
   It was M/S/P to continue the program without modification, and to accept the draft review with a few minor revisions. The next review of this program will take place in 2008/9.

6. Discussion of Modern Language and Literature Five-Year Review
   Postponed until Fall, 2004.

7. Discussion of the Proposed Actions from the Workgroups
   a. Policies and Procedures for Committee operations (draft revisions prepared by Strait)
      It was noted that any revisions we make to our policies and procedures must be approved by ExComm. Guo expressed concern about the review of tenure track allocations. It seems clear that such review is not part of COBRA’s responsibilities;
thus it would seem to fall to CAPR, but our bylaws are unclear about whether or not we should be providing input into tenure track decisions. If CAPR and COBRA are not charged with providing input, what faculty governance organization is? Are we concerned with this issue? Strait feels next year’s CAPR should continue this important discussion. Clarence recalled that, historically, the President has expressed a desire that some faculty body—ideally CAPR--give input into tenure track allocation decisions. Strait expressed WASC concerns that subsequent to CAPR’s review of a program there should be a meeting with the dean, the department chair, etc., during which there would be further clarification, and commitment to a plan for following the recommendations outlined in CAPR’s review. CAPR’s reports should include its reactions to the program’s stated need for additional tenure-track faculty; reviews should include CAPR’s judgments on the importance of the program and the need for additional positions. The appropriate administrators would take CAPR’s input into consideration as they make their deliberations, of course considering budgetary implications. Lubwama suggested we call the process “Tenure-track Review, instead of “Tenure-Track Allocation.

Guo further noted that the proposed amendment to the CAPR Policies and Procedures is intended to keep the language from conflicting with the change in the Senate bylaws passed March 2003, which established COBRA. However, the version of the suggested change of CAPR Policies and Procedures that was provided by Susan Correia eliminated the original Article 8 under Section 2 (Duties and Organization), which states "To perform other duties regarding annual tenure-track faculty allocation, as directed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate." Since this Article does NOT conflict with the current by-law, this article should NOT be eliminated (if the intention of the change is to make the language consistent with the by-law).

It was agreed that CAPR will continue discussion of this matter in the fall.

b. Revision of 00-01 CAPR 7
Discussion of this document will be continued during 2004/5. Potential revisions may include the addition of programs for review such as the GE Clusters, University Writing Skills Requirement, the Library, etc.

8. Report on Campus Physical Planning Committee (Clarence)
Clarence briefly reported on the April 5, 2004 meeting in which plans for a bench in memory of Faculty Government Coordinator Connie Sexauer were discussed. This bench will be erected in the lawn area west of Warren Hall. The committee also evaluated plans for renovations of the Amphitheatre.

9. Adjournment
CAPR members offered an acclamation to Michael Strait for all his hard work during the year, and also commended those who served as Secretary, and those members who prepared draft reports of program reviews. The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Clarence, Secretary
This is what I would like to include in the minutes:
The proposed amendment is intended to make the language of CAPR Policies and Procedures not conflict with the change of the Senate bylaw passed March 2003, which established COBRA. However, the version of the suggested change of CAPR Policies and Procedures that was provided by Susan Correia eliminated the original Article 8 under Section 2 (Duties and Organization), which states "To perform other duties regarding annual tenure-track faculty allocation, as directed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate." Since this Article does NOT conflict with the current by-law, this article should NOT be eliminated (if the intention of the change is to make the language consistent with the by-law).

This is just an explanation, and please do not include in the minutes, since it will be confusing:
At the meeting, I also thought that since the new by-law does not include the contents stated in Article 8, and therefore, it must be wrong, since the ballot in March 2003 did not vote to strike it out. But that line of thinking was incorrect (as I think of it now), since the by-law does not go into that detail, and the current by-law kept in Susan's office is consistent with the passed ballot, with no errors.