Members Present: Judy Clarence, Kim Geron, Vish Hegde, Michelle LaCentra, Sally Murphy, Julia Norton (Chair), Janet Patterson, Linda Smetana, Gale Young, Helen Zong

Visitors Present: James Petrillo

Members Absent: Asha Rao

Chair Norton called the meeting to order at 2:08 p.m.

1. Approval of Agenda
   The agenda was approved.

2. Approval of the Minutes of October 21, 2004
   The Minutes were approved with one correction.

3. Report of the Chair
   Chair Norton thanked the committee for carrying on without her at the last meeting. She expressed her regrets about the tragedy in Asha Rao’s family, and urged members to donate to the memorial fund for Asha’s sister if they wish.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   Provost Clark has reported to Young concerning the procedures for the discussion of the tenure track allocation process linked to program reviews: the deans will discuss issues with the department chairs, and the chairs will confer with faculty to get input on the tenure track allocation process. On November 15th the deans will discuss and evaluate the feedback they received in that consultation process; at that time the Provost will indicate the next steps to be taken. He’ll share what comes out of those discussions with CAPR. Clark is pleased that CAPR is planning to provide criteria for review delay

5. New Business
   a. Request for Discontinuances of the “Creative Arts Option” and the “Recreation and Community Theatre Option”, both in the Theatre Arts Major
      Theatre Arts has revamped its major. Students who need these options can get them within the regular program.
      M/S/P to approve discontinuance.

   b. Graduate Multimedia Five-year review.
      The committee commended Petrillo for preparation of an excellent document. Chair Norton called for a motion for the program to be continued without modification; the motion was made and seconded. Discussion followed. Norton asked about tenure track hires—Petrillo responded that there is no resident faculty in this program—all faculty are resident in other departments.
Young questioned the program’s collection of assessment data. Petrillo responded that there is data available, although it’s not included in the report. Most assessment is done in the second year. Standards for progression through the program are rigorous (some students drop out). Petrillo could provide CAPR with criteria for outcomes and indicators. He’d like to increase the required units to 60 and will soon propose this, so that students who come in with diverse skill sets end up with some degree of uniformity.

Murphy noted the outside reviewer’s recommendation that more courses on programming language are needed. Petrillo agreed, adding that the Computer Science dept is too structured to be of much help. The program needs to make skill oriented classes for generalists available. There’s a faculty member in the Art Dept. who is highly competent in computer programming. An extra class would be needed.

Smetana has offered to prepare the draft review. Models of previous reviews are available in the Senate office. Petrillo will provide further data on assessment, including requirements for advancements to candidacy.

After Petrillo’s departure, the committee discussed the role of CAPR and the reports. Young felt that our job is to determine the quality of the program under review. Our job is to assess academic excellence. Norton pointed to the rubric from the WASC COT as an important element, and stressed that CAPR’s evaluation of quality is vital to resource allocations.

The committee noted in this report an absence of information about graduates’ preparation for careers in the field. It was felt that in preparing the reports CAPR should refer to past Five-year reviews and their recommendations. For every program we review, we should receive the CAPR summary of the last review. Norton will see that these are provided.

A friendly amendment was made to the previous motion: we will accept the Multimedia report (rather than voting at this time to continue the program). The vote for continuance will take place at the next meeting, when we’ve had a chance to review the draft report. M/S/P.

The Committee will ask Multimedia to add to its report the following:

- Data on students’ advancement to the second year
- Data on how are alumni are doing, and how they rate the program’s effectiveness.
- Comparison with similar programs in the CSU.
- Data concerning decreasing enrollment
- Reference to the previous 5-year review
5. Old Business
   a. Program Review Schedule
      Assignments were finalized for review responsibilities. It was noted that all
      of the College of Science departments are up for review. Much of the work
      carried over from last year has been done, and we’ll soon receive those reviews.
      We already have French and Spanish. Theatre/Dance has requested a delay.

      A discussion about requests for delays followed. A detailed outside
      accreditation that’s taking place could be a valid reason for delay. Young
      suggested that the dean’s opinion on a request for delay is important; if he or she
      agrees with the request, perhaps the delay should be granted. Generally, the
      reasons justifying a delay must be truly extraordinary (example: FERPing
      faculty, retirements, death, etc.) Young suggested that we grant something like an
      “incomplete”, which would include a report stating how far along the department
      is in the process. Murphy agreed. Norton will draft these ideas into a document
      for departments to follow. She will send letters to Math and Theatre stating that
      CAPR approves their requests for delay provided they send us a progress report
      by March 1, with the whole report coming due in Fall 2005.

      All other review materials must be submitted to CAPR by the end of Winter
      quarter (March 1) according to CAPR 7.

   b. Continuing review “Committee A procedures” and other CAPR
      Documents
      We’re not yet ready to discuss this, so the matter was postponed.

   c. Discussion of Engineering Five-Year Review (Outside Accredited)
      document
      CAPR has not yet discussed the review; Chair Motavali will be invited to a
      future meeting. Because this is a new program, no past review exists with which
      to compare it.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Judy Clarence, Acting Secretary