

Minutes for EPC Feb. 24, 2005

1. Changes to the minutes from previous meeting. Postpone Program Review Agenda approved
2. Chair's report
 - SPC 2nd meeting – SSU is to grow @ a maximum rate of 5%/year and in 10 years there will be 10K bodies and 400 more FTES
 - The provost has been asked for a detail report about the financial aspects of FYE and the 2nd reading of the FYE will not happen at EPC without this report.

Mary was late due to parking and opposes the minutes.

Motion-Table the 1st reading of the FYE proposal until there is a clear statement about the resources for this program. Maker- motion out of order because we would attach a document about funding??? (not sure I got this right)

The motion was 2nd by Ben Pugno and Art opposed the motion

Bob-Need to hear what the program is about continue with the first reading

Vote: 2 to uphold the motion, rest opposed

Binder on resources under APC/EPC documents on the alignment of resources with the mission of the university in the library.

1st reading of the FYE presented by Paul Draper

This will be a pilot program of 150 students based on the view that we need to take care of both the academic and social aspects of education. There is a powerpoint presentation on the GE website for more details of the program which will not be repeated here.

Discussion of the FYE:

Bob – Wants to know how much faculty time is involved in this program. How faculty will be replaced in the department and the cost to the department. Also it was unclear if we are replacing these faculty or are they going to be teaching the same stuff in the FYE?

Art – Put together a specific list of questions for the provost. WTU assignment to the lecture and this could cause conflict with the union. 10 unit model makes more sense to generate the WTU's for the faculty. No budget for assistants and the need to get a good comparative data.

Paul's response – the program will be assessed in three ways

1. Office of institutional research
2. Program coordinator (outside)

3. Program leader will implement an assessment rubric

An assumption has always been that one of the roles of faculty is in program assessment.

Art – agrees with this point in principle but there should be more wt for the faculty work. EMC steering committee wants to be part of this process.

Bob – Show me the money. Will it come off the top or from a particular school? Have faculty been picked to design the curriculum? Are the English or/and phil departments on board?

Elaine – There should be an external body that assesses the program feasibility.

Paul – This will be done by the program coordinator and office of institutional research

Mary – How are students going to be selected for the program?

Ben – Resource question came up at the AS discussion. Will a board topic insure a rigor program? And support them in upper division classes. Are we lowering the bar?

Paul – Not correct we are raising the bar

Greta – What is the assessment at the 3rd or the 4th year and shares concerns about self-selection. Unclear on the relationship and connection to composition 101

Elaine – follow up question. A2 and A3 and an additional English course over the four years.

Bob – History of eng 101...EYE is not an inter-disciplinary program it is a lecture series. Before you can say that 101 isn't good you have to first assess 101.

Elaine – eng and phil department

Paul – eng has been very involved the chair has been at most of the meetings and the phil department has been involved.

Bob – individuals do not speak for a department. He wants the department to sign off on the proposal

SSP – eng 30 and eng 50 students that need a lot of help....what happens to them. There are only 30 SSPs how would the ssp workload be supplemented? Can't take all of them out of their office for 6 hours/week.