CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING & REVIEW

Minutes of the meeting of November 20, 2003

Subject to approval

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

Visitor: Laurie Price, Chair, Anthropology

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

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

2. Approval of the Minutes of November 6, 2003
   Chair Strait asked the committee to review the corrected minutes, which were not available before this meeting, to be voted on at the next meeting.

3. Report of the Chair
   Strait reported that he was notified that Associated Students would be sending a representative to CAPR meetings in the future; the name of the student designee has not been forwarded to him, however.
   Strait said he had yet to receive formal word from Julia Norton of ExCom’s “re-charging” CAPR with crafting a policy requiring that five-year program reviews incorporate standards reports within their documentation. He will follow up with ExCom on this matter.
   He said that he has also received a request from Communications to do a modified program review, excluding an outside reviewer, as previously discussed, and that this request will be formally presented at the committee’s next meeting.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   N/A

5. Other Business: Library Committee Report (change in original agenda order)
   Professor Guo, CAPR’s representative to the committee, said that while the library has been able to protect its academic staff during the current budget crisis, an alarming 20 percent cut in their budget for acquisitions – books, journals, etc. – has been made permanent, and will not be adjusted annually to account for inflation. He said that it appears that book collections will suffer the most while, at the same time, investment in electronic media is increasing. He raised the concern that the emphasis on information literacy, including the WASC emphasis on assessment of students’ information literacy skills, may be re-focusing the library’s priorities. Was its focus shifting from resources to skill-acquisition? Guo asked if the library itself would be up for a five-year review, and Strait remarked that, once again, such a question begs consideration as to what CAPR should be considering a program that is subject to a five-year review. Clarence added that while the library formerly had a research allocation, it was now requesting tenure-track positions; however, the library did not report any requests for tenure-track allocations to CAPR last year.

   A discussion about CAPR’s evolving role vis a vis resource allocations ensued. Since the library assesses each department’s requests for acquisitions, Lubwama asked if CAPR had a role
to play here, or was this a COBRA matter? Strait indicated that CAPR could certainly help programs make better arguments for resources. Guo noted that a case needs to be made that, once again, a very good staff is achieving excellent results with limited resources. Additionally, while WASC will review certain library data, as defined formulaically, according to Gale Young, WASC doesn’t send in someone to look at a library’s subject collections; it remains unclear who, then, will be responsible for formally evaluating the quality of its collections.

6. **Continuation of items not completed last meeting**

   N/A

7. **Work Group Updates**

   Strait noted that as soon as a new organizational space is created for on-line communication among work groups that he would e-mail everyone about future assignments. In the meantime, he distributed two handouts, which were suggested drafts for a) CAPR’s Five-Year Review Protocol in 15 steps; and b) an Evaluation Response Form for the committee’s discussion. The latter form is meant as a worksheet for each committee member to use when reading through a program’s five-year review. These worksheets can be turned in to the main evaluator who is charged with writing up the committee’s formal response. Clarence questioned how much of a burden there was on that individual evaluator; would there be feedback from members beyond this worksheet? Lubwama noted that, as in the past, CAPR members would have read a draft of the evaluator’s report, usually via e-mail, and have had ample opportunity to provide feedback to the evaluator, who can incorporate additions and changes into his/her report before it is filed. Department representatives have also been invited back to a subsequent CAPR meeting to respond to the draft report, as necessary.

   Further discussion was suspended to allow for the time-certain (3 PM) Anthropology Review.

8. **Anthropology Five-Year Review**

   Laurie Price, Chair of Anthropology, characterized the most significant change in the department to be a reinforcing of the sub-field of Applied Anthropology, the field that she, in particular, was hired to address. She noted the establishment of the M.A. in 2002, with enrollment that has increased from an experimental cohort of 5 to a current enrollment of 55. (Note: Price disputed Institutional Research’s current enrollment figure of 34.)

   Besides the establishment of the M.A., Price noted that curriculum revision in Applied Anthropology is ongoing in the undergraduate curriculum as well; a proposal for funding to develop a Service Learning course, for example, could result in requiring service learning of all undergraduate majors.

   Price noted that the External Reviewer’s report urges more tenure-track hires; tenure-track slots have been steadily decreasing, however. The downward trend in tenure-track positions has meant appreciable increases in the ratio of advisees to faculty (currently 24:1) and has resulted in the Chair herself being responsible for a preponderance of independent-study courses among graduate students. She noted that Hayward’s is the highest proportion among all of the CSU’s Anthropology departments, and that with a projected retirement in Fall 2004, the Anthropology T/T faculty will shrink to a new low of three members. She referred to the section in her report documenting the Chair’s (that is, her own) increasing responsibility for a full-time teaching load, as well as undue burdens placed on young, untenured faculty in the short and long-term.

   Price characterized the department’s main goal as gaining approval for more tenure-track hires in the light of program development and the erosion of T/T positions. She noted that her request for a tenure-track hire last year was not forwarded to the university administration by the ALSS College’s Dean.
Another area of concern was the department’s ability to maintain its museum, which has served as a venue not only for important exhibits but also for university-wide events. Price concluded her presentation with her concern that serious flooding in Meiklejohn Hall has compromised the integrity of the collection; valuable archival material is in danger of being lost.

Guo, as the committee’s official respondent, led off the discussion: He noted the “exemplary” nature of the Anthropology Department’s review documents, and asked, in light of the data presented, what were the Dean’s arguments against a new tenure-track position being allocated to the department? Price admitted to having been puzzled by that decision herself; she had not been presented with a rationale. Guo then postulated whether Anthropology was seen as being too top-heavy with graduate students; that is, is university-wide priority being given to the development of undergraduate programs and the faculty and resources needed to develop them? Price countered that if that is indeed the case, her mandate to develop a graduate program is in some jeopardy, and further, that the university, in curtailing the growth of graduate programs such as hers, would be doing so at its peril, since data suggest that significant FTE growth lies in such graduate programs. Strait noted that the Anthropology Department could make the case that it is now providing a necessary applied/professional degree, one that could be said to be analogous to CSUH’s new M.S.W., and thus deserving of similar institutional support. If graduate students “cost more” per capita than undergraduates, departments need a way to justify that expenditure, as well as to ensure that their numbers are counted – for example, when graduate students affect the head-counts of upper-division undergraduate classes. Even further, can departments such as Anthropology make the argument that more M.A.’s bring in more B.A. candidates? Strait further emphasized that “replacement” is not considered a valid argument when seeking tenure-track positions. Gale Young suggested that tracking learning outcomes could prove a boon in T/T allocations; she noted how that such a strategy can become clear when an essential option, such as the American Presidency in Political Science, is clearly in jeopardy when there are no faculty available to teach it.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Gubernat