

**Academic Planning Committee
Meeting with the Faculty
Meeting Notes**

May 14, 2008

Broome Library, Room 2325

Members:	Steve Lefevre Jeanne Grier Steve Stratton Mary Adler	Deborah Wylie Andrea Grove Jaye Smith Amy Denton	Gary Berg Kathy Musashi Sean Anderson
Guests:	Colleen Rivera Sean Kelley Debbie Hoffman Traceylee Clark Ted Lucas Julia Balen	Paul Rivera Joan Karp Beth Hartung Renny Christopher Dan Wakelee AJ Bieszczad	Scott Frisch Peter Smith Cindy Wyels Ching-Hua Wang Ashish Vaidya

1. Introduction and Purpose

Steve Lefevre welcomed all to the meeting and explained the purpose of the meeting. He reviewed the CSUCI and CSU process for program approval and the need to examine the Academic Master Plan for change under the current budget constraints. The Committee requests the input from its faculty on how to proceed going into these lean years ahead. Jeanne Grier reviewed the concerns of the committee and highlighted the 1) fiscal impact and 2) significance of meeting enrollment targets during the process.

2. Distributions

The following documents were explained and distributed to the attendees:

- A. Academic Master Plan as approved by the Trustees, March 2008
- B. Proposed Degrees and Contact Information
- C. Academic Master Plan and Internal Planning Calendar Program Criteria
- D. Academic Master Plan and Internal Planning Calendar Worksheet

3. Discussion

The group began its discussion focusing on the limitations of zero growth and that the number of degrees on the plan exceeds the number that can be implemented, especially in years 2010 and 2011. The group emphasized need to be prepared when the current financial crisis lifts. It also discussed the criteria that would be considered during the evaluation of any movement of degrees on the plan. Several suggestions were made to amend the criteria that would clarify each item as well as add in master level considerations and special session considerations.

Ted Lucas and Ashish Vaidya both commented on the probable financial impact for the next few years. It may not be until 2011-2012 before the CSU experiences financial relief. Ashish expressed his concern that enrollment targets get elevated to the top of the criteria list and that community needs cannot be ignored.

Steve also spoke to the timing impact of the WASC Substantive Change process that will now encumber our master level programs, essentially adding another year to the process. It is likely that the WASC submittal would occur only after some level of Chancellor Office approval occurs, thus adding additional time to the entire approval process. Steve also reviewed the possibility of Fast Track approvals in the WASC Substantive Change process.

There was considerable concern regarding insufficient tenure track faculty and its effect on program approvals. The group discussed various ways limited faculty might impact a new program.

Beth Hartung advised the committee that the degrees ought to be revisited by faculty to see if they still had the same level of support as when they were once proposed. In her case, she could see the delay of Criminal Justice Minor but supported the timetable with regard to the BA in Anthropology.

Deborah Wylie updated the group on the status of the three pending construction projects (North Hall, West Hall and Gateway). All these projects will be pushed back at least one year, if not more. Bond funds for higher education will not be available. She anticipates that there may not be new facilities in the next five years.

Administratively, the decision for the BS in Applied Physics and BA in Chicana/o Studies has been made to launch in 2008. The MA in English will be delayed and will be the first degree to go forward under the WASC Substantive Change process.

Other possibilities of handling degrees and emphases such as partnerships were introduced by Ashish.

As a way to assist APC in developing a draft academic plan, it was suggested that each proposed program submit a one page synopsis addressing the criteria to the Academic Planning Committee. It was also suggested that proposers come before the committee in the fall to support their degree and suggest a realistic launch time.

Several people discussed reallocation of the University budget, and discussion of marketing certain programs with slow growth to balance enrollment among degrees.

Lunch

A group took a short lunch break and continued the discussion and agreed to continue the dialogue in the fall.