

Educational Policies Committee
Minutes September 15, 2011
Recorded by Amy Kittelstrom

Members present: Armand Gilinsky, chair; Melinda Milligan; Christina Baker; Elaine Newman; Paul Ramey; Carmen Works; Mary Dingle; Amy Kittelstrom; Paula Hammett from the library for Joe Marquez; Jon Kornfeld for Elaine Sundberg; Chingling Wo

Changes to the minutes from 9/1: Paul Ramey was present; insert EPC's prerogative to recommend or not recommend waivers for the American Institutions requirement.

CW motion to approve; EN seconded.
Minutes approved.

Chair report:

- Task force appointed by Senate to write a letter on the spring fee referendum: Ben Ford, Terry Lease, Rick Luttmann, Sharon Cabaniss, Noel Byrne. But there is a legal action on the referendum, so it may be delayed
- Emeritus dinner scheduled, and question before the Senate over honoring Art Warmouth for exceptional service
- SSU has no written policy equating a unit of academic credit with either seat or study time. Elaine Sundberg is planning on drafting one.
 - EN pointed to the example of Cal Poly SLO where they have posters emphasizing the amount of study students should do, and suggested that such a drive would benefit our campus
- AG needs to appoint a voting member of this committee to serve on the Program Review subcommittee
- Liaison spots that need to be filled: University Standards, and Senate Budget Committee
 - CW wants to know whether the EPC chair is automatically a member of the Senate Budget Committee
 - PR can't make the APC meetings after all; EN volunteered to do that.

EN wanted to return to the question of paper vs. electronic and wants to make a request that syllabi be submitted electronically and that the relevant information be summarized for EPC purposes, off the example before us of the Philosophy department's syllabus trying to change from three to four units. EN emphasizes that it is not our role to evaluate content, but the program and learning objectives

- CW pointed out flaws in the philosophy proposal and moved to send the proposal back to the department to clarify what they are requesting and to submit appropriate forms. EN seconded.

- AG raised a question about the effect of these revisions on GE, and EN remembered having signed the forms regarding the change to four units last year because the GE subcommittee had approved them.
- CW raised a question of whether philosophy could go down to 16 unit for their minor
- Decision reached to send it back to philosophy

MD passed out a revised program review for Coms. Will get approval of Joe Marquez before sending it on to provost.

Provost Rogerson arrived: introductions. Rogerson talked about the major challenge of no faculty hires for next year because we overhired last year. This is a budget-driven choice; even hiring two faculty would have depleted reserves for hiring adjuncts and serving program needs. He has a dream to go through this year and to start having faculty under Ben Ford's leadership define what SSU is going to be five years from now. Why does a student want to come to SSU? Making a student successful in the work force is going to float to the top of revised mission proposals. Criticized current advertising material linking SSU to wine country rather than academic success. Emphasized his wish to let change happen from below rather than top-down; he is listening and trying to get money to accomplish objectives. Would really like to see a clear mission to distinguish SSU from other universities in the competitive period we are in.

- CW talked about program review and the policy that invokes the provost's office, how departments are struggling to work under these conditions, and the MOU that has bounced back and forth between the provost and deans. Rogerson has some awareness of the problem and thinks that success hinges on solving the budget issue.
- MD asked about the changes we're going to make and how that emphasis overlooks the good things we're doing. Rogerson agrees; he needs to learn what is going on here and then go out and boast about it. He calls SSU a best-kept secret; we need to talk about the changes that are going on in American and in higher education and how we might fit into that. MD just saw an article on the increase in digital technology and extended education and wants to know how that complements what we do and how we are in competition with extended ed. What faculty overview of those programs exists? Rogerson talked about the valuable role of extended ed in a university in reaching out to non-traditional students and the importance of making sure extended ed remembers that role and promotes itself on that basis. MD remains concerned because this campus has been serving non-traditional students all along. Rogerson talked about the program at Solano Community College with an average age of 45; MD countered with the success of our program at Ukiah and still wants to see a more formal delineation of the different responsibilities. Rogerson says the Ukiah program is actually costing us money. EN wants to see a clarification in the faculty role in overseeing these programs.

- AG reminds us that we are meeting with Mark Marikel at the end of October along with faculty union representative and others to address some of these issues.
- AK asked about the plan regarding tenure-track hires vs. adjuncts. Rogerson acknowledged that this is an emergency decision and said that the long-term solution involves unity among the deans trying to increase revenue sources from somewhere other than the state, of which he has identified four: grants and contracts; extended ed; donors; international and national programs.
- EN asked about curricular innovation and the obstacle that not knowing departmental budgets poses to those efforts. Could there be a budget given in a timely way so that faculty could do planning on that basis. EN expressed a sense of encouragement by Rogerson's availability, listening to faculty, and response. Rogerson said that 56% of the budget goes to Academic Affairs, vs. 70% at Fresno; he wants to change this.
- AG talked about a report done at UC-Berkeley school of education regarding higher ed in California recommending that community colleges be allowed to grant 4-yr bachelor's degrees and that CSUs move toward specialization, increasing the number of polytechnics, e.g. Wants to know whether there is any conversation about specialization of SSU as part of the new vision. Rogerson said no, nor has he seen the report, but doesn't think that would happen fast. He thinks our goals are solid, and the discussion is how to implement them.
- CW asked about his speech at convocation on the topic of graduate programs. Rogerson clarified that he doesn't think we need new graduate programs, but more students in existing programs, and emphasized that we should encourage our students to do a graduate degree because that's where the future is, to get jobs. Biggest growth sector in America is master's education, up 120%. Would like to strengthen our graduate programs. CW noted that in the past our motto of do more with less has encouraged people to go through extended ed, so she wants to know whether future graduate programs would go that way, and Rogerson said no, only certificate and non-credit programs. AG asked whether the thrust will be toward building new student cohorts in residential programs or attracting non-traditional students? Rogerson said it's not his decision and he wants it to come from the faculty, but is inclined to suggest that it's the traditional students he expects to draw.
- CW appreciates his vision but points out a tension on campus because faculty likes non-traditional students in light of the university's historical mission attracting local people with affordable education. Rogerson agrees and emphasizes how strategic this initiative must be.

Jillian Parker from Philosophy had thought she was due for 12:15 and arrived then. AG delivered the feedback generated earlier in the meeting: this amounts to three proposals, and so three need to be submitted. We want to see what additional work will be expected for the four unit courses and that these expectations be explained more systematically and uniformly. Second, regarding the changes to the minor, to

check on the number of units and have that in a separate proposal. Will need to go through Elaine Sundberg for all these, and then the A&H curriculum committee. Third, the actual change in concentration for the philosophy of law and applied ethics.

- EN noted that some programs provide a table where different curricular objectives are outlined, and asked about the claim that there are no changes on learning outcomes. Could this be clarified?

MD will not be here 9/29 and asked to trade with CB, who agreed, so MD will be doing minutes 10/27.

PR asked about the Campus Allies for Racial Responsibility organization whose representative will be coming to an upcoming meeting. Do they have a role in curriculum and educational policies? EN responded that this invitation came at the request of the committee on diversity and agrees with PR that more clarity on what we could be doing for their cause would be helpful. AG asked whether he should ask Chris Bowers of CARR for a statement. PH suggested that could be a priming for his visit to EPC rather than in lieu of one. PR says it should be coming to the AS senate if it's a student organization.

AG notes that the ENSP curriculum will be pushed off for some time.

MM asked about the Program Review Subcommittee and who will be liaison. AK volunteered.

CW moved to adjourn and EN seconded.