CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING & REVIEW

Minutes of the meeting of November 6, 2003

Subject to approval

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

Visitor: Julia Norton

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

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

2. Approval of the Minutes of October 16, 2003
   Lubwama moved the minutes be approved. M/S/P

3. Report of the Chair
   Chair Strait announced the election of Kevin Callahan of the College of Science, to replace Assim Sagahyroon on the committee. He then brought up the issue of the definition of an “academic program” for further discussion in light of CAPR’s charge to conduct program reviews, noting that formerly, that is in 1993-94, what had categorized those programs subject to review was their granting a degree in their field of study. At times, however, the definition is not so unambiguous, he said -- for example, when a degree program is shared among departments, as is Advertising, or located within a department and offering a specific degree, such as the M.S. in Counseling within the Education Department. He also raised the question of whether this committee should schedule five-year reviews of so-called “service programs,” and was a program such as the WST (Writing Skills Test) subject to review? He asked that CAPR’s work group investigating program reviews address the issue of which programs will come to CAPR for review, in what packages, and who, within such programs, would be the responsible parties.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   Frank Martino introduced Gale Young as his replacement on CAPR. He said that her role would be to apprise him of the committee’s deliberations on a regular basis. The Provost then assured CAPR that he would be more than willing to show up at any meeting when the committee felt that his presence was necessary. He regretted that the current proliferation of new committee assignments had made his regular attendance at CAPR meetings impossible. In answer to a question from Professor Norton, he acknowledged that there would indeed be a national search for a new administrative post heading up Institutional Research and Assessment. Guo asked if either the Provost or President Rees could provide this committee with annual briefings on how tenure-track allocation decisions have been made at the university level. Martino allowed that he was uncomfortable with the vagueness of such a charge from CAPR. He said that he once again bemoaned a situation whereby a committee was charged with examining resource-allocations from within a fiscal vacuum. How tenure-track allocations are decided upon, he said, is a clear and public process; why decisions are made each year, he said, is “reasonably clear,” and he promised to appear before CAPR with whatever relevant, specific data about the process the committee might ask for in the future.
5. Appointment to Campus Planning Committee
   After a brief discussion of the nature of the responsibilities and duties of this position, Judy Clarence agreed to serve as CAPR’s representative (also, in light of the fact that she would no longer be representing this committee on the Lay-off Committee, since CAPR’s spot there had been reallocated to COBRA). Moved by Guo. M/S/P

6. Work Group Updates (order of business switched from original agenda)
   Both Julia Norton and Chris Lubwama provided the committee with a recap of the history of the “standards” policy that CAPR’s subcommittee had presented to the Academic Senate last year, a policy which did not receive Senate approval. There was much discussion as to whether the resistance to including data about academic standards in a five-year program review might have been due to objections to using a program’s GPA as the benchmark. Norton contended that CAPR needs to re-visit this document and re-cast it in other terms; that is, the language of the policy document should provide a way to enable each program to demonstrate how it is measuring “content mastery” over time. Strait noted that even while GPAs had not changed in 20 years, there was a sense among members of the faculty and staff that standards had been lowering over time, that is, that students were being required to do less work for higher grades. Rodriguez asked what evidence existed to confirm such a perception. Zong questioned the validity of CAPR’s making any kind of judgment about the meaning of an individual program or department’s GPA. And what leverage would the committee have, she said, in any case? Hegde asked if correlations should be drawn between GPA outcomes and student evaluations (of faculty/classes). Lubwama mentioned that complaints from business employers could be correlated with lowering of standards in certain classes, but Zong countered that rectifying such a situation might well lie in the province of the Chair of an individual department, and not with this committee. Norton acknowledged that this debate over standards-reporting had raised issues related to academic freedom among faculty; Strait acknowledged that some of the concerns raised in the committee during this discussion might be better defined as faculty-development issues.
   Guo asked whether, in fact, CAPR had already fulfilled ExCom’s charge last year: Why re-visit the charge if the Senate itself had rejected the very policy that ExCom had asked the committee to architect? Norton, however, assured the committee that ExCom’s intention remained clear in charging CAPR with the responsibility to define a policy that mandated some integration of standards-reporting in the five-year reviews. Because of time contingencies, Strait called an end to discussion at 3:30. He said further discussion of this matter would continue via Blackboard; e-mail alerts would be sent to members when material was posted. Gubernat noted that during the last meeting this committee had agreed to have such discussions via e-mail and not via Blackboard, and Strait concurred: the Blackboard site would be used archivally. Lubwama moved that the committee request that ExCom re-write the “standards” charge and present it to the committee again. M/S/P

7. Program Review Schedule
   Changes and updates:
   Anthropology was due to present at CAPR’s next meeting, so that its materials were due by 11/12. Modern Languages and Literature will present their revision of last year’s review in the winter quarter. Liberal Studies would write a request for postponement and not be due for a five-year review this year. A proposal is forthcoming from the newly merged Mass Com/ Speech Department for a modified review, a self-study that would waive the outside reviewer’s response. Music had asked for, and would receive a five-year review. Public Administration would be realigned with its outside accreditation for 2006.

   Respectfully submitted,

   Susan Gubernat