

EPC Minutes
14 December 2006
taken by Lynne Morrow

Present
LM, SB, MH, SC, BC, KE, LL, TS, CW, RR
Elaine Sundberg, Carol Blackshire-Belay

Absent

Routine Items

- 1.
2. approved – no new items
3. No agenda to approve
4. No report, will do an end of semester report to Senate
Margie's proposal re Grad Students going to Senate
5. absent
6. Art Warmouth is going to Senate to present coordinate Academic planning with resources. Do we have resources to address mission? Is there a plan to match resources to lower division program needs?
Looking for outside funding, e.g. Extended Ed
Workload- Senate asked for a workload taskforce. Questionnaire sent out. Will be revised to address Human subject issues.
7. tried to digest the EPC motion re unaffiliated grad students. They were not ready to take any action. Margie is making a presentation to the Senate today re workload and curriculum
8. 2 meetings ago Sascha and Tom Shaw reported on Assessment. Very impressive plan. Recommended to Nathan and to EPC is to ask them to attend EPC to report.
MH – many budget questions
9. no meeting
10. budget summit in the Senate some time in Spring, also workload
Birch Moonwoman workload survey – appears that average faculty member works 60 hours per week. Reimbursed for 45. Adverse effect on health and family time.
FYE – approval for 2nd pilot year contingent on review of FYE impact on programs. No financial impact statement yet; propose that pilot be suspended until resources given.
11. they reviewed files for reinstatement.

Business Items

1. CK and SM – WEPT is one of many ways to satisfy the State standard, GRAR. Nationally, assessment is moving from an end-exam toward regular assessment over the semester. They want to raise the level of methods of bringing writing to students across the curriculum on this campus. Asking for feedback about the idea. They believe writing requirements should change with the times.

BC – would dept's assess this writing?? CK – yes

SM – they want to do a faculty survey for ideas

KE – BUS dept has decided to do this, their accred requires BUS writing

If they require BUS writing, can it subst for WEPT??

TS – how many students are multiple test-takers? CK – 25-30 % = 250-300 students
Have you presented this to GE subcomm? CK – not yet, SM – is member of GE sub
One concern re assessment is Does this replace WEPT? How will depts be assessed?

LM – I teach 6 or 7 classes and want to include writing but have been discouraged
because of the time. CK – Writing staff can help assess that writing.

MH – any thought of teaching Eng 101 by PhD's because of substandard current
writing

BC – encouraged by including writing within the discipline, How would you work
with dept's to know whether it is adequate

Elaine Sundberg – other campuses that have more than 1 required writing course have
students who do better. Most univ's include a 2nd writing course.

TS – FYE, what does it mean for univ writing standard? It means that FYE students
don't take a writing course.

KE – don't care whether it's taught in Eng, just that they learn how to write for BUS.
BC – workload issue??

CW – in spirit of liberal arts educ, we should learn how to write in non-discipl ways
SM – he concurs

SC – were 2nd writing courses upper div or random?

ES – varied, CSUSM has writing req in every course

RR – has it been tried to use WEPT as a jury exam to get to Junior year. CK no,
written for Junior level

LM – suggest to use general course and then have 2nd course as discipline-specific

SB – wouldn't this add units to major?

TS – writing across discipline seems useful, but usu staffed by ENG staff. Resources??
Suspicious when ENG depts give up the teaching of English and writing.

MH – how can we help you?

SM – KE and ES and SM sit on GE subcomm. They will come up with an approach to
GE

Addressing TS – very sensitive to issue of giving up writing. We're trying to honor the
many ways of teaching writing across campus.

2. Meri Storino – only for School Counseling program not for MFT.

10 years since curriculum looked at

new natl model for school counseling

AB1802 \$2 million extra approved for school counseling

Met with School of Soc Sci Grad Studies about curriculum change

Counseling dept started as only MFT (community)

15 years ago School Counseling was added with only one specific course

School Counseling required classes have been added over time,

current proposal is 8 more than original

BC – are you meeting NCATE assessment? MS – yes

SC – are current courses being changed/added? Will you need more faculty?

MS – no

TS – very clear proposal. Specific courses – 520A and B, distinction between elem and secondary

What is the need for 527 Ethics?

MS – the field has changed from focus on a person and to focus on a program (A to B)

Ethical issues have come up around abuse and sex issues, counselors need to become comfortable with these discussions in age-appropriate ways.

Special Needs issues are also addressed.

Trying to make program more cohesive.

Motion: SB move KE 2nd to waive 1st reading

Question called KE

Unanimous move to 2nd reading.

KE moves to approve 2nd reading, CW 2nd

TS – is there a down side??

MS – yes, workload, and trying to find qualified adjuncts

Unanimous approval of proposal. Goes as a consent item to Senate.

3.Jagan Agrawal – Engineering

changes driven by changes in Comp Sci curriculum, adding elements to BSES curriculum, adding senior design project req's

major units remain the same

curriculum comm's have signed off

ES – CS dept is changing unit value of their courses. You are further reducing the amount of CS courses for the degree. Is that sufficient?

JA – our program has more CS than most programs. Although new course has an ES number, it is also a CS course (cross listed)

Several other courses (465, 380) are cross listed

CW – who gets FTE for cross listed course?

JA – depends on how students registers

TS – your resource statement – consent note from CS doesn't say whether it increases their workload.

JA – no, there is a course substitution, fewer sections

RR – how many students and faculty?

JA - 20 soph, 20 frosh, 3 faculty

TS – are you hiring?

JA – 2 retired, hiring 2

Motion

LM – waive 1st reading, SC 2nd

Unanimous

TS – enough faculty?

SC – cross listing allows faculty freedom

TS – are there enough resources?

JA – yes

Motion to Approve – CW, BC 2nd

Unanimous, goes to consent calendar

4.(Discussed at the beginning of meeting)

TS, proposal is diff than what we voted on at last meeting

ES thinks she came to talk about Curriculum Approval Processes

MH Program Review will be considered at 12:15, 2ND item also delayed is Forms Interface between Academic affairs, academic programs and policy

****---

SB – req to suspend Program Review was made

Soc Sci faculty in support of suspension

Steve moved that suspension be made until resources outside existing Academic Program funding

CBB had said that it was not a given that current funding method would continue

SB – Schlereth and the Provost are equal on the hierarchy chart.

CBB – talked to provost about how funding is planned for Program Review

(attachment) varies from School to School

[attachment taken back to add specific date and attribution]

MH – asked that statement be added that Program Review funding is ongoing

BCC – the Deans could change their minds about how it is doled out

ES – Program Review is not a line item

BCC – budget is no longer centralized, deans have discretion about how program review is funded. No certain amount is directed toward

MH – if prgm rev is funded at school level, why is it a university program?

ES – Senate charges EPC to supervise program review

KE – prgm rev is a central part of your program. Dept's should request funding for prgm rev based on their stated needs

TS – thanks for document; it clarifies some things. In A&H the allocations are not what is listed on this document. The release came out of their allocations

Question is: can this document be sent to School dept's with an attribution?

CBB – yes

CW – our dean talks about budget, our budget has been cut by \$1.2 million but FTE has increased. Faculty is asking for more of the growth money for the program review.

MH – you may remember that provost said that budgets were going to go up by 10% and we wouldn't have to worry about impact of FTE

SC – program rev moneys comes from the given budget, which didn't include it before. I polled school chair; every person should get 3 units for prgm rev

Some dept's like nursing and counseling have to do constant program rev. Liz Close says that they spend 10 hours per week, and that other things suffer. Need 3 units per semester. Education gets that.

CBB – re Forms

Brought an org chart for Academic Affairs

SB – prgm rev, Senate Budget comm. wants new money to be given for Program Review.

CBB – suggest that the request be made to President

SB – travel, etc. have been impacted by the lack of funds for program review

TS – reminded that motion is on the table

CBB – isn't the resolution old? Didn't Andy Merrifield have a letter?

MH – this is the resolution that passed. (The history is in the minutes)

This is the compromise that was created after Provost re-wrote the 1st document.

SB – re-reads the motion:

I move to suspend the current prg rev policy pending the appropriation of adequate and permanent funding resources.

TS – I support the feeling of the motion but we don't have the blue paper policy in front of us. Move to postpone until 1st Spring meeting, with policy before us.

Support MH making a report to the Senate about this resolution.

SC – if budget subcomm's are made aware of this, it will bring some discussion

MH – will report to Senate as a pending item

Motion – SC 2nd TS's motion

Should we suspend resolution?

Motion passes unanimously. Carries forward to 1st meeting of Spring

ES will attend 1st Spring meeting re Forms

5.