CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY HAYWARD
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW

Minutes of the Meeting of October 21, 2004

Members Present: Judy Clarence, Kim Geron, Vish Hegde, Michelle LaCentra, Sally Murphy, Janet Patterson, Asha Rao (Acting Chair), Gale Young

Visitors Present: R.H. Good, Michael Leung, Saeid Motavalli, Don Sawyer

Members Absent: Julia Norton, Linda Smetana, Helen Zong

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

1. Approval of Agenda
   The agenda was approved.

2. Approval of the Minutes of October 7, 2004
   The Minutes were approved.

3. Report of the Chair
   Due to the absence of the Chair, there was no report.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   Responding to Clarence’s question at an earlier meeting, Young reported that, according to the Provost, the Library is indeed part of the review process for tenure-track allocations, and one Library tenure-track position has been approved.

   Concerning a discussion of the possible delay of some of the program reviews scheduled for 2004/2005, Carl Bellone and Young met with the Provost and the deans. It was decided that in order to meet the necessary requirements, all degree programs up for review should remain on the docket for this year, and should not be postponed. If necessary, next year’s CAPR should complete the remainder in Fall 2005. It was noted that there are not as many programs up for review in 2005/2006. After the meeting, Young received a further email from Norton concerning possible delays, but a subsequent discussion with Provost Clark reaffirmed that, in light of WASC, CAPR needs to stay on schedule with its review processes. He further stressed that we must include assessment results in all reviews. Contrary to previous practice, CAPR should not honor requests for delays except in truly exceptional cases.

   Clark has asked the deans to report to him by Nov. 15 concerning the tenure-track allocation process, including CAPR’s role in this process as it collaborates in the academic review COT with input from the deans.

   Murphy expressed concern over CAPR’s ability to handle the program review workload and produce quality reviews. Sawyer suggested involving departments in the process of scheduling.

   Leung agreed that CAPR must insist upon the element of assessment as we prepare our reviews, and Geron urged that we continue to enforce deadlines—which may include putting pressure on outside reviewers to complete their reviews in a timely fashion.

   As an example: at the last meeting CAPR approved Math/Computer Sciences’ request for a delay, and now it appears that the justification for this delay was insufficient. CAPR has traditionally granted these delays. It may be inappropriate to retract our early decision in this case, though the Dept. may not yet have been informed as to the outcome. Norton will be asked to investigate. It’s clear that we must develop guidelines for approving delays.
5. **New Business**
   
a. **Approval of New BA Major Program in Physics**
   Prof. Good presented the case for this new major, stating that a BA in Physics in addition to the BS (which will be a subset of the BA), will require no new courses and has no fiscal implications, except that it will hopefully attract more students.

   In response to Young’s question about assessing learning outcomes, Good responded that students learn more in the BS, which includes more advanced mechanics and other courses than does the BA. BS students most frequently will go on to graduate school; the majority of BA students will go into teaching.

   M/S/P to approve the proposal, with recommendations to the Department to strengthen its argument before moving the proposal along.

b. **Approval of New MS Degree in Engineering Management**
   Prof. Motavalli explained that this will be a multidisciplinary program, with the College of Business. Similar programs exist at three CSU campuses in the South, and in the North only Santa Clara University offers such a degree. One new course would be added (ENGR6400), for which there are adequate resources in place. A survey indicated that 80% of respondents agree there should be such a program at Hayward. Young and the Committee complimented Motavalli on the thoroughness of the proposal.

   M/S/P to approve the proposal.

c. **Engineering Five-Year Review (Outside Accredited)**
   Dean Leung noted that it’s unusual for a new program to be approved for six years by an outside accreder as this one was. He invited CAPR members to review the extensive accreditation materials which are available in the College office. He also commented that the outcomes assessments are not as thorough as they will be in future years concerning graduates and their status and preparation for the field, but learning outcomes were included; these will constitute the documentation upon which CAPR will base its review.

6. **Old business**
   
a. **Program Review Schedule**
   - Both Theatre/Dance and Math/Computer Science have requested delays, and Tom Hird has made a recommendation concerning problems with interdisciplinary appointments. CAPR members decided that this issue should probably come before the Faculty Affairs Committee issue rather than CAPR, unless the matter arises as part of a program review
   - CAPR members decided to postpone the discussion of the prioritization and scheduling of reviews for 2004-2005 until Norton is present. Concerns about the workload issue remain. Murphy noted that if each member prepares two reports per year, we may finish the scheduled reports in the next academic year. We seem to have inherited a lot of work from last year’s committee. It might also be possible to work on reviews over the summer. Use of the recommended rubric should streamline review preparations.

b. **Continuing review of “Committee A” procedures and other CAPR documents**
   This item was postponed until the next meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Judy Clarence, Acting Secretary