

Education Policies Committee

Minutes

10/02/2008

Members present: Tristan Kelly, Katie Hatch, Sharon Cabaniss, Brantley Bryant, John Wingard, Elaine Sundberg, Carmen Works, Kirsten Ely, Lynn Morrow, Mateo Clark, Karen Grady

Liaisons present: Bob Coleman

Visitors: Susan Moulton, Nathan Rank, Elaine Leeder, Mike Ezra, Robin ??, Melinda Barnard, Patricia ??

1. The meeting was called to order
2. Meeting agenda changes
 - Elaine moved from #4 to #1 to give her time. Nathan will stay at #4 spot.
 - EPC agrees to postpone CLA. Hand-out will be sent by email today.
 - Agenda changes approved
3. Meeting minutes from
 - Page 2, Elaine Sunberg name needs change
 - Minutes approved
4. Reports
 - CW: Art therapy was discontinued
 - JW: report from graduate committee; post-BA students (graduate student) need to maintain a GPA of 3.0, pre-BA students need 2.5; there is a conflict if a student enrolled as both; it is a campus level rule; ES says that this issue is on the administration radar, and working on how to account for students in the system
 - KE: university standards committee was cancelled last week
5. WASC Report with Elaine Sunberg
 - ES: Team report from WASC in EPC packet
 - ES: The WASC team came and visited SSU, then submitted reports to the WASC commission, and then the WASC commission wrote the final letter (single-spaced letter in packet). Commission accepted recommendations of the team.
 - ES: There were six issues for SSU to work on; we will go with the priority order outlined in the commission letter. These are: 1. President no confidence vote; 2. Reach consensus on SSU mission; 3. "yoke" the planning units into cooperation; 4. Assure educational outcomes; 5. GE reform; 6 Extend diversity efforts
 - ES: For item #4, SSU has been working on program reviews, which are part of the EPC review process. There are still 8 departments that have not done their self-study assessments. For example, Global Studies needed a delay to give time for Geography to complete its review.
 - ES: After EPC has done its work, the Provost and Deans will draft a MOU to address the issues and concerns found in the department program reviews.

- ES: For item #5, EPC is a subcommittee of GE committee. Nathan Rank will report to EPC later in meeting. Commission is asking SSU faculty and administration to reach agreement on what we intend to do with GE – e.g., tweaking, reinventing, etc. The commission is looking for not only an agreement but that we also have a timeline to meet those goals and some evidence of progress toward meeting those goals.
- ES: For item #6, EPC has a stake in diversity initiatives because of its involvement with staff and curriculum issues.
- ES: Action plan table in packet is a draft; the latest versions are in the portfolio.
- SM: We're experiencing some serious cuts to programs; how is the WASC report going to respond to the budget cuts and damage to programs? This is not in the action item plan. How do we protect our majors and programs?
- ES: JCAP and budget affairs committee have a role in the response. There will be a diminishing of expectations relative to what could have been accomplished with the proper funding. In SSU's response, there is a space to address the large structural context issues that limit SSU's ability to address WASC concerns.
- SC: Is the program review process as it stands acceptable by WASC?
- ES: WASC will look at direct assessments of learning outcomes. They may come back and talk to some departments about how assessment is done. They will want to see evidence at the department level. We need to summarize these efforts to present to WASC, possibly through efforts with groups of departments.
- TK: Regarding the GE issue, what is the status of the 3-unit, 4-unit pattern question?
- ES: GE committee had Provost come and talk to them about the issue; she is not sure where the conversations stand at this point. With diversity, there are many initiatives but no central focus or commitment to organize the efforts. For GE, Nathan has made it clear that their committee should not drive this initiative.
- CW: Told Provost that the 3-unit/4-unit transition should come from departments and faculty, and that EPC is involved in that decision. In his proposal, it was clear that classes would have to disappear.
- KE: In program reviews, it was generally found that departments need more money. At some point, somebody needs to decide which programs are sustainable. There at least needs to be an overview summary of the EPC letters.
- SM: Thaine expressed interest in a summary in Spring 2008.
- BC: EPC is not about determining which programs should stay or go, but it does have the ability to say whether it can function given constraints. Re: 3-unit/4-unit issue has been floated before. EPC should be involved in the process.
- SM: at the heart of these issues is the role of governance. There are a lot of top-down initiatives developed and imposed before there is time to debate them. The question is if there is a standardized procedure for various bodies to have information before initiatives are inacted. There is a conflict where faculty-led initiatives conflict with administration initiatives.
- KE: It would not be difficult to summarize the program review letters if this is done as each program is reviewed. KE is willing to take the initiative to summarize the reviews.

6. Jewish Studies second reading – Elaine Leeder, Mike Ezra, Robin ??, Patricia ??

- ME: Bob asked for a 4-year plan. But this is a minor. Why does it need a 4-yr plan?
- BC: The idea was to show the sequence of classes and how they will be made available.
- ME: Outstanding issues from the first-reading were: how donated monies would be used; would EPC be willing to allow this as a pilot study rather than permanent program (rather not, but willing to hear this possibility if EPC directs this); letters of support from English, Political Science, Music and Sociology – from the department chairs. These were not in the EPC packet but were passed around.
- BC: The department faculty should sign the letters.
- CW: The chairs sign letters representing their departments. EPC accepts the letters from the chair.
- LM: Music 370 – jewish music included? ME: no conversation that he knows of.
- EL: Gave a presentation of the history of the Jewish studies minor; this is an ongoing effort; she founded a similar program at Ithaca that was successful; ME has been leading the effort, but it has been a very collaborative effort, including a wide range of faculty; the donor is outside of the process and plays no role in the curriculum; donors have provided 3 years of support; it has been clear to the donors that if the program is not approved, then that is the end of the process; until the program is approved, the donor will not go out for more funding; ME has written some excellent syllabi for the program, EL has reviewed them; she is completely aware of the resource limitation and would not bring this forward if it could not be funded.
- SC: It is not clear from the letters, if they reflect the will of the departments. Exception was the letter from Political Science , which explicitly states that it does support the department views; there was a concern about the program viability and drain on resources because it is funded by soft money; there are issues of work from full-time faculty; what if the soft-money disappears?
- EL: Adjunct faculty would be hired by the funds; if the money disappears, then the program disappears. The program will not be funded from the general fund.
- BC: Technology program had a minor, working for endowment funds; different structural relationship with program vs. just classes.
- Robin: about 35 donors attracted, 5 are foundations that are hard to get access to. Possibly these donors will see SSU for other programs.
- EL: money goes into a foundation account and earns interest.
- SC: somebody teaches the course and gets paid. EL: ... and adds money to department
- SM: all of these terms need to be in writing, so that money doesn't come out of other programs.
- EL: temporary program will scare off the donors
- MC: question about program falling apart, what happens to students enrolled already?
- EL, CW: there are procedures to help the students get through the program.
- CW: There needs to be action taken on this because it is second reading.
- SM: Maybe this is language: maybe you could call this phase I and phase II?

- KE: Motions that EPC approve Jewish Studies as a permanent minor, with condition that it will go through deactivation process if there is not a sufficient endowment by the end of the 3-year period that is already funded.
- LM: seconds the motion.
- Committee moved to discussion.
- SC: assumption is that the extra money could help departments to help fund other classes.
- EL: the money is dedicated to the Jewish studies program
- SC: money in A&H that can be used for whatever they want – how does it get used?; second, nothing in the budget to help with ongoing fund-raising efforts and ME was to get back to EPC on that issue.
- EL: ME is not the fund-raiser.
- SC: Is this in writing?
- EL: the committee is composed of faculty and they understand the constraints.
- BC: observation is that EPC should make a package that is acceptable by APC. ME mentioned that he would take on the work-load to keep the program effort moving forward; ME considers it university service and that donors will give him more payment for his work if asked.
- Resolution approved. One opposed vote, rest of EPC approved.

7. University Courses – M. Barnard

- MB: All courses are approved to be in catalog – in the last 10 years; all vetted at some point.
- MB: Courses taught by Unit 3
- MB: Monies come from existing budget; Univ 150 budget from Academic Affairs; Univ 103 are skills classes are paid for by grants; Univ 238 courses are paid for out of Provost budget as an emergency hire, but will not continue this.
- MB: If unit-bearing courses, then SSPs must be paid overtime.
- MB is currently the interim reporting dean; Chuck Roads should be consulted for more information.
- CW: Encourages EPC to look at course catalog, as there is a history of a course getting through that that wasn't accepted by EPC.
- ES: this was an error in the catalog.
- CW: MB will need to come back to answer more questions.

8. Alternate Plan for Program Review -- GE committee – Nathan Rank

- NR: Presented results of GE committee discussion and other consultation; plan sought to find what is working well in GE and what needs to be improved, and how to develop a plan to address those issues.
- NR: In the process of developing learning outcomes of GE courses as they currently stand; GE program wants to comply with directives to be reviewed periodically; consulted with outside person at SJSU for advice and her input went into the development of the plan; currently using development metrics that are in place.
- NR: GE committee is looking for an EPC endorsement so that it can be presented to the Provost.
- CW: this is needed to move forward with the plan since GE subcommittee is under EPC
- SC: question about developed learning outcomes.

- CW: Learning outcomes that are being developed and can be used, but not applied to every class.
- SC: Point about draft plan. “Revised” GE program is the appropriate term, not a “New” GE program.
- SM: Is there a place to look at student advising? There are issues of diversity, WASC issues-- where are those going to appear and how will they be addressed?
- NR: 3c addresses issue of student advising; Is diversity a self-study issue or program review?
- CW: Diversity is part of EPC program review so can refer to that for guidance.
- SM: How are classes going to be assessed? On a certain time cycle? NR: Assessment plans should be built into revised GE plan from San Jose state plan.
- BC: Embed the assessment process into the new plan, thereby “renewing” the program
- CW: Do we want a new draft or move to endorsement.
- LM: Motion to endorse plan with modification from EPC comments.
- JW: seconded motion.
- Approved unanimously.

9. Meeting adjourned.