

Present: Sharon Cabaniss, Marci Sanchez, Vincent Richman, Rick Robison, Thaine Stearns, Perry Marker, Carol Blackshire-Belay, Jarrod Russell (2006-7 VP of Student Senate--proxy for Lindsey Simoncic), Elaine Sundberg, Mary Halavais, Lynne Morrow, Art Warmouth

Absent: Carmen Works, Steve Bittner

Guests: Erik Dickson (ex. Director of AS), Melanie Dreisbach, Mary Gendernalik Cooper, Lynn Close

PM called meeting to order at 10:54.

Agenda: correction: minutes by Carmen W, not Marci Sanchez); Approved as corrected

Minutes:

Corrections to 27 April minutes: page 1, AW; change in vote on word “amendment”; Vincent Richman noted as present; Marci Sanchez’s proxy noted by PM. Approved with changes.

Reports:

Chair Report: PM confirmed with committee that letters for program review were received. Announced 2nd reading of FYE in Senate for today (11 May), asked EPC members to be present. Brief discussion of Senate’s 1st reading of FYE.

Business:

TC 11:00: Department of Education: Dean of School of Ed. Mary Gendernalik Cooper and Chair of Department of Educational Leadership and Special Education (ELSE), Melanie Dreisbach. Presentation of Program review for School of Education:

PM explained procedure for the two program reviews today; asked Mary and Melanie to provide brief overview; asked EPC

MGC explained accreditation for Education: State and National [NCATE: National Council for the Accreditation of Teachers of Education]—Dept. of Education accreditation report incorporates all levels of accreditation (SSU, state, national); components of report; process; resources; standards; distinct aspects of professional dept. accreditation. Offered chronological narrative of NCATE review procedure, including dept. response to assertions regarding standards. Referred body to NCATE letter (22 December 2005) granting SSU first-time accreditation. Noted one “suggestion for improvement” (as distinct from a condition for accreditation); to make governance operations more publicly visible. NCATE accreditation cycle is initially 5 years, followed by a 7 year return.

MD: noted additional standards to NCATE required by other accreditation bodies; different media requirements; and extensive interviewing of SSU D of Education constituents. Also explained what “passing” signifies.

VR moved to waive first reading of D of E program review
LM: seconded
Unanimous vote to waive first reading.

SC: asked regarding letter of approval to which we were attending

MGC: read official NCATE letter to Rubin Arminana (11 Nov. 2005).

PM: asked that letter be circulated at meeting for EPC review.

SC: asked regarding whether approvals at various levels were consistent

MGC: affirmed that all levels of approval were in synch. NCATE expects program approval as condition of their departmental approval.

ES: What was size of team in visits from various accrediting bodies?

MD: NCATE: 5 members; State teams: 3 per program

ES: what were benefits of process for D of E?

MD: absolutely transformative; uniting; clear purposiveness of dept.

PM: spoke from his D of E perspective, affirming MD, adding importance of putting data assessment into practice and performance.

RR: How does national accreditation help students coming out SSU to teach outside of state?

MD: students still have to get accreditation in state. But NCATE is a recognized standard that is beneficial.

RR: Is there any move toward national accreditation of teachers?

MGC: Explained details involved in separate state accreditation.

VR moved to approve D of Education Program Review
SC: seconded

PM: asked for discussion. No discussion.

Vote: approved unanimously

11:45 TC: Nursing Accreditation: Liz Close, Chair of Dept. of Nursing

LC: National accreditation for Nursing Dept. is voluntary; however state board accreditation is mandatory, every 8 years; 4 years interim review. National accrediting body—NLNAC (National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission, Inc.). Explained that lack of resources made for less than smooth process. Other problems: visiting team had members who were in training. Good process, but not great. Result was full accreditation for documentation, exhibits room. SSU nursing faculty covered potential problem areas efficiently, and none that were of potential concern were noted by accrediting body. Problems noted: No support for distance learning outreach and teaching. Limited reimbursement for faculty development. Limited support for faculty outreach (nursing employs a field-based pedagogy). Both graduate and undergraduate programs received accreditation. Strengths of dept. include retention of students.

Lack of resources provided for ongoing evaluation process means that continuing with NLNAC has become a question. It is desirable, but without university support for ongoing evaluation (not every 3 years), the process becomes onerous.

Noted GE courses taught by Nursing and dept. commitment to diversity (faculty and students) and particular issues that arise for Nursing. Some key demographic categories (male, Native American) higher than national average. Recruiting issues (only 50 Hispanic doctorally prepared nursing professionals in the country)

Questions:

SC: asked specifically regarding resource problems.

LC: particularized the difficulties surrounding lack of support for accreditation vis-à-vis Nursing. Said that strategically it might have made sense to fail accreditation

ES: asked a general question to the body: should we match committee prog. Review protocol to national standards or state standards? Might EPC include in letter to Provost a statement regarding resources?

LC: SFR in Nursing is 44:1. Lack of faculty in field.

AW: How does SSU Nursing compare to other CSU nursing.

LC: 3rd highest SFR. Lower average pay for SSU Nursing faculty.

RR: Asked about EPC procedure re: recommendations from the body. EPC needs to craft a statement of support from EPC in the form of recommendation.

PM: clarified what EPC role is re: recommendations

PM: asked for motion from body to waive first reading. Explained that in a motion for

MH: move to waive first reading

LM: seconded motion

Vote: approved unanimously

MH moves to approve Program Review; however, adding the following statement: “EPC affirm that resources are needed for effective program review, as noted by National accreditation body in the successful program review. Resources allocated to Nursing program are insufficient and lag behind other CSU programs, despite its award-winning status and successful national accreditation.”

LM: seconded motion

No discussion

Vote: approved unanimously

12:25: Diana Grant, Criminology and Criminal Justice. Name Change for department to Criminology and Criminal Justice reflected in change in name of degree.

DG: context for change: 5th member of faculty hired for Fall 2006-2007; 6th line is approved.

Name change reflects mission of dept. “Criminal Justice” is practice; “Criminology and Criminal Justice” involves theory, the latter which is the focus of the dept.

LM: Why the lag in change of degree, given that President signed name change for dept.?

MH: How many majors?

DG: 200 declared

SC: What is name used for degree in other CSU departments? What about accreditation agencies for dept.

DG: No accrediting agencies for CCJ. Different CSU campuses have different names, reflecting distinct foci. Social Justice is a focus of dept. but that would be a major change, to change name and mission to that focus.

ES: Background on procedures for name change for dept. v. name change for degree. Currently BA in criminal justice admin. The dept. is undertaking to match degree to name of dept.

TS: What’s in it for students?

DG: It’s clearer for students—if they don’t want to go into correction or law enforcement—if they wish to go to graduate school it likely increases viability.

LM: Does every campus get CCJ degree name, given that it’s a chancellor approval?

DG: No—it's specific to each dept. on each campus

MH: moves to waive first reading

VR: seconded

Vote: approved unanimously

MH: moves to approve name change for degree: "Criminal Justice" to "Criminology and Criminal Justice"

RR: seconded

No discussion

Vote: approved unanimously

PM: End of semester business discussion, specifically agenda item on 4 Unit GE courses. Options: next semester? Next meeting?

SC: Asks for Provost or Provost's designee to attend EPC and take proactive approach regarding the issue.

PM: Hearing no objections, cancels final scheduled meeting for Spring 2006.

ES: Commends Perry Marker for service as 2005-2006 EPC chair. Unanimous acclaim by body.

Meeting adjourned 12:52 p.m.