

**Minutes, Educational Policies Committee  
February 18, 2016; 11:00 am – 12:50 pm**

Present: Laura Watt (Chair), Tim Wandling, Kristen Daley, Kathryn Chang, Tia Watts, Nathan Rank, Melinda Milligan, Felicia Kalker, Chiara Baciagalupa, Alvin Nguyen, Luisa Grossi, Richard Whitkus (arrived 11:25 am), Steven Winter (present for KIN items)

Meeting called to order by Chair Watt. Agenda was approved (no changes). Past minutes (02/04/16, by Nathan Rank) approved as submitted.

Consent Item: ECON 217 – Permanent GE B4

Approved, with clarification that title would be as requested by the GE Subcommittee (“Statistics for Business and Economics”). Chair Watt confirmed it was listed as such on the most recent version of the MCCCf.

Chair’s Report

Chair Watt reported that the revision of APC (currently on hiatus) into a new committee had been approved at the last Senate meeting. It will be known as APARC (Academic Planning, Assessment, and Resources Committee). Elections for the committee will take place soon. Its charge will include assessment and resource issues, so the current Senate Budget Subcommittee will be folded into it. The current EPC Program Review Subcommittee will also be folded in, but it is not known if it will become a subcommittee or be folded into the main committee. Program Review will remain an EPC Subcommittee for Spring 2016. There was discussion of the potentially high workload for the new committee. Watt noted the thinking was that it was better for the committee to have too much to do and to parcel it out, rather than not to have enough to do.

Discussion: EPC Working Groups

1. TA Policy Working Group

Olivia Smith (former student member of EPC) wishes to continue her involvement with the working group, even though she is no longer on EPC. It was agreed that she will still be allowed to report to the group, but will not be a member.

Wandling reported that the group had met several times in Fall 2015 and had agreed to ask departments to complete a survey (a draft of the survey was written). Smith was to gather information from students. Wandling asked if staff could gather basic descriptive information on the use of TAs (courses used to award credit, numbers enrolled, etc.). Watt asked AVP Whitkus if Faculty Affairs could provide this information? Whitkus said he would look into it. He noted he could certainly look into TA Policies elsewhere.

Discussion of possible ways to proceed with gathering information on current use of TAs. Discussion of need to clarify other related categories such as teaching associates, readers, supplemental instructors, and lab assistants and their relation to the category of teaching assistants. T. Watts noted the connection to wider workload issues, including that she has heard some faculty hire non-SSU labor to grade assignments. Wandling noted the question of whether lecturers should supervise TAs, given that they were doing so as volunteers. Milligan suggested beginning by doing an initial survey of department chairs to identify the course numbers used to award TA credit, which would then allow the number of students in these courses to be identified. Chair Watt asked if the group might split the survey into two parts (basic info and then a more in-depth follow up). Wandling and Daley indicated they would prefer to administer the more extensive

survey already drafted by the working group. Wandling noted he preferred to go to the School Curriculum Committees, rather than directly to department chairs, and to look at the catalog to identify the TA courses used by each department.

Chair Watt asked the working group to provide her with the draft survey. She will post the survey, as well as the current ENSP Department TA Guidelines, to Moodle for review by EPC members.

### 2. Curriculum Guide / School Curriculum Committee Guidelines Working Group

Chair Watt reported that much of the curriculum guide is online (posted by Laurel Holmstrom), but is only accessible by direct link. It needs the addition of interstitial text.

Regarding School Curriculum Committees, the goal of the working group is to craft language summarizing EPC expectations. The School committees are not under EPC purview, but EPC can provide guidelines for them.

### 3. Academic Certificate Policy / SEIE Curriculum Guide Working Group

Rank reported that the group met in Fall, but needs to meet again to reconnect. The group also needs to connect with SEIE Curriculum Committee Chair Deborah Roberts. Rank will work to schedule these meetings. The group's focus is 1) to investigate the certificate approval process, given that the campus lacks a definition of a certificate (specifically the min. number of units needed for a certificate) for either academic or non-academic credit certificates and 2) to investigate if EPC should have more involvement in the approval process for non-academic credit certificates.

Milligan noted that under the current SEIE policy, the SEIE Curriculum Committee was supposed to bring any approved certificates to EPC as information items. She asked Chair Watt if any had come forward this academic year. Chair Watt said none had, but that she would check in with SEIE Chair Roberts.

Grossi will join the working group to add a staff perspective.

### Discussion: Follow-up on previous GE Discussions

Chair Watt reported that she met with GE Subcommittee Chair Heather Smith and EPC VC Rank to further share ideas on possible action with regard to assessment and/or revision of the current GE program. She reported the following from their conversation: (1) there is anecdotal information about the current program, but little data; (2) the GE program is scheduled for review in the next academic year, so it may be useful to do the review with a special eye toward the relevant Executive Order and possible reform options; and (3) it is unknown who will lead the GE review next year, especially since Watt, Rank, and Smith will be on sabbatical.

T. Watts noted her department (CS) would like to have a survey on what departments need from and contribute to GE. Wandling noted his concern about continuing to talk without taking action and that he would prefer to proceed with assessment, but to simultaneously proceed with moving forward on options for change. Chair Watt noted there are many reform options, so she would prefer to move cautiously and to avoid unintended consequences. Kalker noted (1) the funding model should be looked at, since GE is tied to funding; (2) student input should be gathered, since the student role is key; and (3) it is the role of Institutional Research to assist with comparative data. Milligan noted concerned over having sufficient people power to do both assessment and a plan for change simultaneously. Rank noted it is good to know about the current system and to concurrently plan for change, but to take a lesson from program reviews, which are often too

ambitious. For example, a narrowly defined set of issues such as the three set out by Kalker would be a reasonable way to go. Wandling noted that the GE Subcommittee members regularly raise concerns about the current system during course proposal review process: comments are often made that a course must be approved because it meets the learning outcomes, but there are issues that the current system does not allow them to address. He noted that to privilege assessment means delaying change at least another 1.5 years. Chair Watt noted that EPC/GE members represent only a narrow subset of faculty and we should know what faculty as a whole think of GE. She concluded the discussion by noting she would send the notes from today back to the GE Subcommittee.

#### Old Business: Follow-up on Proposed Discontinuance of Two Kinesiology Concentrations

Proposal author Steven Winter (KIN faculty) joined the EPC meeting for discussion of the proposed discontinuance of two concentrations within the Kinesiology major: Adaptive Physical Education (APE) and Physical Education (PE). Based on the public hearing on the proposed discontinuance (held Feb. 4, 2016), he had been asked to return to EPC with a revised proposal rationale. Chair Watt advised those present that, since the hearing, she had received an additional document related to the proposals: an email from Jennifer Madhavi (EDUC faculty) submitted in response to Watt's EPC report at the Academic Senate (now on the EPC Moodle page and to be included in the discontinuance materials presented to the Senate). In addition, she reported Elaine McHugh (KIN faculty) contacted her to ask if public comments on the proposals could still be submitted. Finally, she noted that Winter had submitted a revised version of the discontinuance rationale.

Winter summarized the revisions to the discontinuance rationale. The revisions note that, due to the decline in student interest in pursuing teaching as a profession and the resulting decline in student interest in these two concentrations, the KIN faculty voted unanimously in Spring 2015 to pursue discontinuance of the concentrations in order to focus their increasingly limited resources (specifically faculty hires) on the other remaining concentrations in the department. Winter explained that, in order to be transparent about the ongoing reduction in the number of students in the two concentrations (at present 1.04% of KIN majors are in these two concentrations), he had added text to the preamble to explain that since Fall 2014 students had been advised out of declaring these concentrations in anticipation of the discontinuance.

In addition, the revision includes expanded explanation of the impacts of the discontinuance on the service area. Due to the discontinuance of the APE concentration, the rationale confirms that "the Kinesiology Department will not be generating BS graduates with the appropriate waiver to enter the SSU's School of Education's Single Subject Credential Program in Physical Education." However, the university continues to attract students who have acquired this waiver at other universities, so there is the possibility they will stay in the area after receiving the credential. Kinesiology will continue to offer the APE Added Authorization program, in collaboration with the School of Education, for credential students and returning credentialed instructors until Fall 2017, at which point two key faculty (Silva and McHugh) will have retired. At that point, KIN will re-evaluate whether to expend the resources to continue the program. Finally, the rationale emphasizes that the university should be encouraged to find the resources to continue the community-based service programs associated with APE (Saturday Sidekicks and Bike Camp).

T. Watts asked if student teaching was a requirement within the added authorization program. Winter responded that it was and that someone would need to be hired to offer coursework and to do field observations of students. Although lecturers could be hired to cover these elements, he noted it had typically been a tenure-track faculty member that had run the Saturday programs as a part of their community outreach, so covering these would be more difficult and would require

additional funding. T. Watts noted that people in the PE community did not seem to know of the discontinuance proposal and so may not have commented. She requested that KIN be asked to get input from the community prior to the Fall 2017 re-evaluation so that information could be taken into account in the consideration of whether to continue the added authorization program.

Wandling moved that EPC lamentably support Kinesiology's decision to discontinue the two concentrations. Daley seconded the motion. No discussion. The motion passed unanimously (9-0-0).

#### Old Business: Revision to KIN MA Program, Second Reading

Winter remained present for the second reading of the proposed revision to the KIN MA program. EPC members were directed to a handout providing additional information on the proposal, specifically, the KIN MA mission statement, KIN MA program objectives, and MA assessment (a survey done every two years). Chair Watt said that, based on review of past EPC minutes, Winter had made the changes requested.

T. Watts recommended that the mission statement be revised because it was confusing as to whether the MA was expected to be an intermediate step to a PhD. Winter noted the SSU MA was typically a terminal one and that the language came from the KIN website.

Discussion regarding assessment of the KIN MA continued. Rank noted that KIN surely did more assessment than that survey mentioned in the revised proposal, specifically, the assessment that is part of program review. Winter said, yes, that was true, although review of the MA program was folded into the larger review of the undergraduate program. Whitkus advised Winter that KIN needed to assess learning objectives in the future, so the proposal should detail how KIN plans to assess one or more learning objectives each year (the survey does not do this). Baciagalupa commented that since MA has a culminating project, it should be assessed. Discussion of whether curriculum revision proposals must include detailed assessment strategies ensued. Some present argued that since program review requires assessment of objectives, the proposals should also explain how this is to be done. Others argued that proposals should state what is actually done, not what should be done in the future.

Rank moved that the proposal be approved, but with addition of revised language to be worked out between Chair Watt and Winter on assessment. Discussion regarding that the statement should, at minimum, be revised to reflect what KIN is actually doing with regard to assessment. Baciagalupa seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously (9-0-0). Chair Watt will post the new language on Moodle and will then move forward if EPC has no comment.

Point of Order: should the committee chair vote? Comments were made noting that they could vote, but that it is practice at SSU that the chair only votes when needed to break a tie. Additional comments were made that it was unclear if Grossi had a vote, given that Senate website lists her as ex officio, but the agenda lists her as a member. Chair Watt will follow up.

#### AVP Whitkus Report

(1) A campus internship policy is being drafted, so expect it to come forward for review and approval. (2) The catalog is vague on when grades can be changed, so look for an upcoming revision to the grade reporting policy. (3) It was discussed at the catalog processing meeting that a decision will need to be made as to how to add the pilot WEPT program to the ARR. This raises that, should the program continue, the MCCCCF will need to be revised to add information as to whether a course meets the WEPT requirement.

#### EPC VP Rank Report

Rank will be having a weekly meeting with Chair Watt. As an aside, he will be participating in a science education grant review panel that will allow him to learn more about assessment.

#### GE Liaison Wandling Report

No report, as comment included in earlier GE discussion.

#### Additonal Report from Chair Watt

Watt noted several liaison positions are vacant. Grad Studies: vacant, but it is less crucial. Program Review: vacant and it is a voting position. Rank says he may be able to attend. Senate Budget Subcommittee: Chair Watt has been attending. University Studies: vacant, but less crucial. Whitkus noted that he already attends Grad Studies, Program Review, and University Standards, so he can report on them if needed.

Additional discussion of assessment of learning objectives (meaning assessment of whether a program's learning objectives are being met). Concern was expressed that many programs do not assess them and they will find it onerous if they are told to do so, but point was also made that this attitude needs to be changed.

Meeting adjourned, 12:51 pm

- Submitted by Melinda Milligan