CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY HAYWARD  
COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW  
Approved as Corrected  
Meeting of October 7, 2004  

Members present: Julia Norton, Asha Rao, Judy Clarence, Helen Zong, Gale Young, Sally Murphy, Michelle LaCentra, Kim Geron, Janet Patterson, Vish Hegde, Linda Smetana.

Chair Julia Norton called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. New members were introduced to the committee.


2. Approval of the agenda – the agenda was approved.

3. Report of the chair – Chair Norton indicated that there was much to review but little to report at this first meeting.

4. Report of the presidential appointee – Gale Young, Presidential Appointee reported the following;
   a. Provost Clark requested the deans to dialogue with their chairs about the connection and/or disconnect between the tenure track allocation process and the program review process and to report back to him by the end of Fall 04.
   b. Provost Clark’s process for determining tenure track allocations for this year only –
      i. At the height of the budget worries Dr. Clark requested that the Deans put forth only their most critical TT requests. Eight positions came forward.
   c. After the golden handshakes were approved and the 3% additional reduction by the CSU was taken off the table, Dr Clark did an extensive analysis of the impact of all separations and retirements on TT faculty. Based on the outcome of the analyses and with the approval of President Rees he decided that CSUH couldn’t wait till 05/06 to make new allocations.
      Provost Clark forewent the “dance of the deans” wherein the Deans make recommendations about the Tenure Track allocations to all colleges. Rather, based on his analysis, Provost Clark is making specific allocations to colleges. In turn, the deans propose to the Provost the departments most needy. President Rees makes final decisions. ALSS and SCI have received their allocations. Business, Economics and SEAS are forthcoming.

5. Review and discussion of CAPR policies and procedures – The committee raised the issue of whether Extension and GE programs should also be reviewed by
CAPR. GE review could be included in the 2007 review cycle. Extension programs that offer degrees and certificates may need to also be reviewed. Another issue raised was that WASC has recommendations for 5 year reviews that CAPR could review and adapt to its review protocol.

6. Election of CAPR representatives to the standing appointments –
   a. Campus Planning Committee – no member was elected at this meeting
   b. Library Advisory Committee – Helen Zong was elected.

7. New Business –
   a. Discontinuance of Commercial Physical Education Certificate. The motion was approved unanimously after verifying that no students were affected by the discontinuance.
   b. Request to delay review of Math/CS department – The request was made because they have a number of searches ongoing. The motion was approved.

8. Old Business –
   a. Discussion of 03-04 reviews and carry-over items – The Chair indicated that some of the reviews were almost complete (Art, Geography) and that she would follow up with all the people who had begun the reviews in the previous year. The committee identified the list to be reviewed this year and the carry over reviews to include 20 programs. Science was identified as a major area for review this year. Some such as Engineering and Speech Pathology, had recently been accredited or were in the process of accreditation, and would require only minor additional review this year. The Chair indicated that each CAPR member would likely have to take charge of 2 program reviews this year and that previews reports were available to preview in the senate office. (The committee secretary needed to review only one.) Committee members were to identify programs that they wish to review and inform the Chair via email. The goal of the review process was to assess if the programs should continue with or without modifications and in some cases be discontinued if CAPR found the reports inadequate. The committee discussed why many program reports were delayed – potentially because assessment is very time consuming. Some such as the Music program asked to be delayed because of their WASC review overload.
   b. Reports from unofficial subcommittees/taskforces – The taskforces had no complete reports for discussion.
   c. Assign tasks – The committee decided to do so once the reports came in.
   d. Review of “committee A” procedures – On Senate mandate the committee was to help develop a procedure for tenure track allocation. It was agreed that we needed to look at the WASC rubric and background material on the process for a better discussion and 8D was carried forward to the next meeting. Don Sawyer indicated that it was a unique opportunity to develop a valuable process.

9. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned with a tentative agenda for the next meeting including preparing for a discussion of 8D above, getting an updated
review schedule and setting up a Blackboard site for CAPR to facilitate information sharing.

Respectfully submitted,

Asha Rao, Secretary