

EPC Minutes

3 December 2009

recorded by Armand Gilinsky

Present

Carmen Works, Thaine Stearns, Melinda Milligan, Sharon Cabaniss, Lynne Morrow, Armand Gilinsky, Sheila Cunningham, Mateo Clark, Lillian Lee, Jenny Tice

Elaine Sundberg for Academic Programs

Robert Coleman-Senghor for APC

Absent – Karen Grady

Called to order @11:03 a.m.

Agenda approved

Minutes from 11/12/09 – not available for approval

Reports

Chair of EPC – C. Works

- Informed us that A&H has a proposal for waiver of 3-unit standard for courses in GE pattern. One course section will be eliminated. Has passed GE subcommittee but not unanimously. Combine seven existing GE categories into five. Reduce GE units required for all SSU students from 51 to 50.
- Informed us that a proposal will be introduced in Senate today for new standing committee on Diversity.
- Informed us that a proposal for new APC subcommittee will be taken up by the Academic Senate.
- Informed us about a proposed \$2.7 million cut to Academic Affairs for 2010-11.
- Contacted by R. Senghas regarding proposed move of Department of Anthropology minor in Linguistics to the Department of English, i.e., moving across schools. Sundberg made note that, once administrative process for such a move is settled, EPC (among other levels of review) will need to review to ascertain to what extent there will be curricular implications and examine the justification and long-term implications for this proposal. Stearns noted that there would indeed be curricular implications of such a move.
- Sundberg noted that there is a program in the Chancellor's Office named "Closing the Achievement Gap" to improve graduation rates. Goal at SSU is to improve graduation rate of 2009 freshmen class by 6 percent. SSU needs to develop a plan to accomplish this by 12/25/09, to be sent to Chancellor's Office. President has asked Student Retention Task Force to develop 5-6 strategic initiatives. These will be reviewed in Spring 2010. Some of those initiatives may be under the

purview of EPC, e.g. developing a policy that requires earlier declaration of majors by freshmen. Another initiative may be to create a Sophomore Year Experience, akin to the current Freshman Year Experience. Saeid Rahimi is chairing the committee that is developing these initiatives.

Academic Programs – M. Barnard (absent)

Liaison Graduate Studies Subcommittee - T. Stearns

- MA program in Organizational Development. Proposal to move this self-support program from Psychology Dept. to Hutchins, but that Department has not been approved to offer a graduate program to date. EPC needs to take up question regarding where graduate programs can be housed, curricular impacts therefrom.
- Sundberg expressed concern that major change from MA in Psych to MA in an interdisciplinary program might result in inconsistency with existing program. We're really a long way from resolving this issue and how a move would occur. How do you change the title of a degree, and should it be more appropriately an MA in Psych.

Liaison University Standards - NA

Liaison GE Subcommittee - C. Works

Liaison from APC - R. Coleman-Senghor

Consent Items

Anth 201 move from area B3 (science emphasis) to area B2 (biological sciences)

Business Items

1. Elimination of History Minor Path, first reading – M. Jolly
Rationale and justification for deleting “Secondary School Teaching Options” from minor (retaining the “General History Minor”) is due to changes in state requirements (increase to 32 units, which is far beyond the scope of a minor) for secondary school teaching credentials. Change in the minor will have no impact on current students.

Stearns noted that: (1) related concerns regarding double majors that ultimately need to be addressed and (2) what we will be approving here are essentially catalogue copy changes.

Cabaniss moved to waive first reading. Cunningham seconded. Motion passed.

Stearns moved to approve changes. Clark seconded. Motion passed.

2. New Minor in Electrical Engineering (EE), first reading – J. Aggarwal
This would be second program in Engineering Science major. It would satisfy need of majors in Physical Sciences and Mathematics for a program (involving 12–26 additional units, depending upon the major) to increase their marketability. It would also provide an option (less onerous, as only 10 additional units would be required) for Computer Science majors who have cross-disciplinary interests. Aggarwal emphasized that the minor was primarily aimed at non-majors in Engineering.

Works enquired whether members of the School of Natural Sciences & Tech curriculum committee had expressed any concerns. None were noted. Tice enquired whether there were any student concerns raised.

Stearns was disappointed that English majors might be left out. Enquired whether different pathways to the minor (10–26 units) might impact total units for graduates and what that impact might be.

Cabaniss enquired if an Engineering major might minor in EE, and whether or not other CSU schools have majors or minors along these lines.

Works enquired whether or not the EE program had been considered as a major program rather than as a “43-unit minor” for those students not majoring in specific departments such as Physical Sciences or Computer Sciences.

Coleman-Senghor enquired why the EE major had not been designed-in to the Engineering program from the outset. Would EE be at odds with the original conception of the Engineering Program. Aggarwal responded that the original intention was for a much broader Engineering Science program that was not specific to Civil, Industrial, Electrical, etc. disciplines.

Stearns asked if an EE minor would indeed have better chances in the job market than a general Engineering major.

Cabaniss commented that such a minor might make sense for students who are interested in pursuing this specific specialized field, so it is appropriate to have a minor.

Tice commented that three students representing the ES program came to an AS meeting to represent this proposed minor, and informed the committee that AS had passed a resolution supporting the proposal.

Clark enquired about the impact on departmental resources if such a minor were offered. Aggarwal responded that such an impact was likely to be minor in terms of increased class size.

3. Program Changes - Sociology, second reading – M. Milligan & C. Stearns
Major new clarification item for consideration is the approval of a service learning course Soci 336 (Investigative Sociology) that would replace and revise an existing course, Soci 436 (Methods Seminar).

Cunningham enquired if the heavy research component of new course would require additional library resources.

Tice commented that it was helpful for students to have a choice among experiential learning, internship, and service learning courses.

Stearns asked for clarification as to precisely what are the changes EPC is being asked to approve.

Milligan informed the committee that the major requested changes are the addition of service learning and investigative courses across the five areas.

Stearns moved to approve changes. Cabaniss seconded. Motion passed.

4. Forms from GE Subcommittee, continued first reading – R. Laney
Laney noted that GE Subcommittee had some discussion but that resulted in no major revisions to the new forms. Subcommittee is waiting comment from EPC.

Stearns enquired as to what are the major differences between the previously approved and proposed new forms for “GE Course Proposal” and “GE Course Modification.”

Works asked that Laney bring old forms to next meeting as well as a document showing changes in language from old to new forms.

Laney noted that major changes in forms are: (1) course content, with respect to specification of learning objectives and/or proposed changes in learning objectives; (2) assessment, with respect to how achievement of learning objectives will be measured; (3) “Purpose and Review Process” section at bottom of old form has now been moved to the top of the new form; (4) Dean’s recommendation nor School Curriculum committee (specifically) no longer now required.

Stearns repeated his request that for second reading of this proposal, the committee be provided with (a) document(s) that clearly shows the specific editorial and language changes.

Coleman-Senghor commented that the school curriculum committee no longer having approval power for GE course proposals may be a major change.

Stearns enquired if a signature sheet for approvals by deans, school committees, etc. would be attached to these forms.

Laney reported that GE committee had run out of time and had not discussed the need for a signature sheet. Requested input from EPC for guidance as to what a signature sheet to accompany new forms might look like.

EPC will take this up in second reading.

Discussion Items

Milligan raised the question of whether Deans were able to negotiate MoUs for departmental program reviews with the Provost.

Sundberg noted that this was something she would investigate further with the Provost.

Cabaniss noted her objection to the involvement of the Dean in the program review process after submission to the Provost.

Stearns suggested that the wording in the Program Review Policy be reviewed and amended appropriately to avoid process flow issues in the future.

Sundberg reported that all program reviews had with exception of one or two departments last summer. Ordinarily, she would have drafted the MoUs subsequent to program review, but due to sick leave, the MoUs may have been sent back to the Deans for preparation.

Coleman-Senghor noted appreciation for Sundberg's clarification of the normal process for completion of program reviews. He also noted the need to formalize how program reviews are finalized.

Stearns moved that EPC form an ad-hoc working group to review language in section 3c of the Program Review policy. Cabaniss seconded.

Sundberg noted concurrence with the motion and suggested that EPC or a working group formed by EPC also take up the entire Program Review policy down the road.

Motion passed. Composition of this working group to be decided at next meeting.

1. Curriculum Guide