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

Visitors Present: Iliana Holbrook, Teresa Myintoo

Members Absent: Janet Patterson, Asha Rao

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

1. Approval of Agenda
   The agenda was approved with revisions: Items 5a, 6a and 6c will be postponed.

2. Approval of the Minutes of November 4, 2004
   The Minutes were approved with corrections.

3. Report of the Chair
   Norton met with the Provost concerning CAPR’s role in Committee A procedures. Norton would like to amend the Committee A report to strengthen the importance of CAPR program reviews in faculty hiring decisions. If CAPR’s program reviews are thorough and substantive, they will constitute our input into tenure-track hiring. Ultimate decisions are made by department chairs and by the colleges; CAPR’s work constitutes the faculty review. (CAPR cannot review all programs annually; our most recent review will be the document considered.) The Provost agreed. If CAPR believes a program needs more tenure-track positions, we should indicate this in our report, without concerning ourselves with the budgetary implications, which are the concern of COBRA. According to Norton, we shouldn’t attempt to prioritize programs’ needs.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   The Provost requested that CAPR postpone discussion of the Committee A procedures document until he can conclude his discussions with the deans. He met with them last week, and has summarized the notes from that meeting. He will bring the notes back to the deans and work with them to achieve consensus. At that point he will meet with Sawyer and Norton, and a CAPR discussion will follow.

5. New Business
   a. Academic Review Final (COT report)
      Norton thanked Young for the excellent WASC report she presented to the Senate. Emphasis has been placed on CAPR’s program reviews. Last year’s CAPR moved in the right direction as it provided guidelines for program reviews. told everyone The College of Science will test the rubric this year. The report’s second theme concerned process, and it reflects what we’ve done in the past. But it’s not humanly possible for programs to write yearly reports, and CAPR can’t review yearly reports.
Hegde suggested that a rubric be formatted, using the present format, so it could be copied and filled in so there wouldn’t have to be as much writing to do. Form could be Departments could score themselves, as practice. Norton added that CAPR members could use the rubric of each report as practice for the review they’ll be responsible for writing.

Murphy noted the recommendations on page 6 of the report. Young explained that these were taken from other CSU documents on campuses preparing for WASC. Members like recommendation 1, which allows CAPR to get feedback as to how our review was received. Recommendation 2 would mean more work for chairs, although the yearly updating makes the five-year review less onerous. In the past there has been no feedback from deans after the annual report is submitted. Murphy felt that a brief annual report could be done in chart form, with only one page of text. Recommendation 3: CAPR members like the idea of program faculty signing the self-study, as an indication that they’ve read it. Murphy was concerned about imposing too many regulations on departments; some departments’ faculty members don’t work well together. It’s important to consider department culture.

6. Old Business
   a. French/Spanish program review

   The 2003 CAPR review never went on to Senate because it was critical of the programs. The new chair asked us to postpone the review until she was able to prepare a new report.

   In this new report, Holbrook has stressed the dire need for more tenure track positions, especially in Spanish and French, urging the hire of a faculty member who could teach both languages. The campus is committed to serving a diverse society, yet the language program is faltering. The French program has been put on hold because both tenured faculty are FERPing. This is of great concern because the French program is gaining popularity as students need more minors. To promote excellence in education, the department needs to offer more than one language major. In an effort to reduce required units, Liberal Studies has dropped its language requirements; now we’re preparing monolingual professors and teachers who may be unable to deal with a multilingual student population. The cultural importance of languages and study of diverse cultures must be recognized and honored. Norton commented that the minor requires too many units. Holbrook countered that all state universities have similar requirements for the minor. Zong noted that last year’s CAPR felt the department was doing an excellent job with a very small faculty, and felt the additional tenure track positions were needed.

The meeting adjourned at 3:52.

Respectfully submitted,
Judy Clarence, Acting Secretary