March 1, 2022 | 3:00 - 5:00, Via Zoom

Present: Catherine Fonseca (minutes), Megan Burke, Mike Ogg, Emily Acosta Lewis, Marissa Mnich, Vivi Yang, Sandy Ayala, Stacey Bosick, Puspa Amri, Heather Smith, Laura Lupei, Merith Weisman

Guest: Emily Asencio (4:15pm)

Agenda approved, 2/15 Minutes approved.

REPORTS

Chair's Report – E. Acosta Lewis

Budget forum is March 10 but is streaming and recording. In light of this, APARC needs to start thinking about budget priorities and recommendations for next year. Emily is hoping to finish that document by March to get to Ex Comm and then Senate. Trying to aim for second-to-last Senate meeting for the 2nd reading for some buffering.

AB 928 (GE Education equivalencies) was discussed at last Ex Comm and Senate. Trying to preserve the living learning component. Emily's sense is that we'll likely have to acquiesce to what UCs decide since it appears they're really dictating this process. This means SSU's GE pattern will have to be reworked once again.

Provost Moranski is putting together a task force for looking at interdisciplinary majors.

A bookstore survey coming out looking at barriers for faculty getting texts on time. Coming from Associated Students soon.

Orientation updates: Transfer Orientation (May 12) planning folks are wanting all hands on deck but obviously it's a pretty hectic time of semester for faculty. August will be a welcome week. The planning group has tried to spread out information across time to avoid information overload for incoming students.

Senate passed a resolution around Chancellor Castro, followed shortly by his resignation just days later.

Program discontinuance vs. suspension policy - Potentially EPC will be involved. The aim is to make practices more transparent and policy-driven, rather than relying on de facto suspension. Conversations thus far are a bit contentious around arguments for/against a program's viability.

Academic Affairs – S. Bosick

Grad Studies subcommittee is still working on how fee advising works across the university.

Derrick German is the Director of Grad Studies and Gillian King Bailey is coordinator for Graduate Studies. Gillian is going down to 60% and so Stacey is looking at picking up the 40% with a kind of joint

work arrangement within Academic Affairs.

Still waiting and close to sending out the call for Dean of SEIE position. Trying to update the POA to reflect an entrepreneurial spirit and improve the program's capacity to generate moneys.

EPC wants to formalize the policy around stacking classes

ATISS report – S. Ayala

Working on review of pilots and procurement for software. Working on streamlining that process.

No quorum this past week in ATISS so they did not meet.

UPRS report – C. Fonseca

UPRS workload compensation ideas were discussed in the last meeting. UPRS expressed interest in pursuing (1) an annual course release for the chair request (equivalent to one 3-4 unit course per year) and (2) stipends for committee members who take on "deep reads" of program reviews beyond the expected committee workload. Melinda Milligan and Diana Grant drafted a proposal request for Structures & Functions to consider. Regarding committee member stipends for extra reads, there's likely support for a one-time basis of support from AA, but will have to go through S&F. Stacey notes that release time will come from existing pool of 50 hours granted to faculty governance, no additional monies are presently available.

BUSINESS

1. Hiring plan discussion

Emily reported that the deficit budget-working group was supportive of APARC taking on and overseeing this work around institutionalizing hiring.

Share outs from breakout groups:

- Suggestion to craft some sort of mission statement that emphasizes hiring will be based on a holistic assessment so we move away from quantitative metrics that tend to favor large departments,

- Suggestion to add a series of questions asking programs to justify the hire along the COPLAC identity (potentially allows for higher priority for undergraduate versus graduate programs).

- The hiring plan template could include joint hires: Some members questioned if this is wise/fair considering there is very little existing structure for supporting cross-departmental hires. One member wondered how do we avoid any detrimental 'bridging' effects on interdisciplinary faculty where they find the demands on their time essentially doubled (e.g. two sets of faculty meetings, opportunities for acculturation/daily interactions/mentorship avenues with home department are 'halved', the risky aspects of interdisciplinary scholarship that may stretch

beyond the norms/conventions of scholarship within the home department, etc.). Other members pushed back on these worries, indicating that the hiring request would ask both programs to justify a joint hire, which in turn would serve as clear documentation for if/how this will be viable and lay out explicitly parameters for doing so.

- Suggestion to compare apples with apples (i.e. small programs to small))and potentially set aside a set number of hires designed for small programs so they have a fighting chance for acquiring a TT line.

- Request to be very explicit about what criteria matter and which don't (e.g., FTES vs. major advising ratios, projected growth vs. curricular losses, growth of major historically).

- Recommendation to potentially invite the Provost/Provost's Office to gain more clarity around existing practices and insight into what is/isn't working within current practices. Other members noted their experiences, analogizing to the *Hunger Games* where university administration awards a certain number of hires based on budget and the Deans ask their school's programs for input and allocate hires based on Dean's recommendations.

- Note that accreditation is a huge priority for getting bumped to the top of the hiring list in order to meet accrediting standards.

- Observation that program review is an underutilized mechanism on campus. Can we close the loop and bring Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) back to governance bodies in order to put teeth/transparency on stated timelines of promised hires?

- Comment that "need" is quite amorphous. Every program has a justifiable need in this current environment. This seems to indicate an even greater requirement of having very explicit criteria for evaluating/awarding hires

2. Low enrollment discussion

Breakout groups brainstorming around guiding questions: Do we use CS codes or is that too controversial and complicated? What should be the minimum number of students to run a course in general? Do we include caveats for new programs? New courses? What is the cutoff here for low enrollment? What else is missing from these conversations?

No time was available for a group share-out

3. Chairs formula

Postponed

4. Emily Asencio (EPC Chair): online learning policy and other updates (4:10pm TC)

Emily Asencio posed a process question for APARC: Will this be a joint document that both bodies will be voting on or is APARC only working in an advisory capacity? Emily Acosta Lewis indicaed the former,

where we are jointly working on this.

Emily Asencio follow asking if this then needs to be two separate documents (policy and process)? Emily Acosta Lewis voiced some concerns of intertwining both policy and process in a single document. Membership indicated general support for separating these two components

Emily Asencio asked how might we frame the 85% benchmark for in-person classes—Is it this number coming from WASC? Is there a way to depart from this WASC narrative? Can we begin framing this instead to our institutional identity? Emily Acosta Lewis indicated that we were going higher with this number since there is anticipation of this will likely be talked down from a higher percentage.

A member asked if the 85% is intended to be per semester or per year?

Emily Acosta Lewis relayed that there have been some concerns voiced from GE Subcommittee and a suggestion to consider GE as a program unto itself that would allow us to cap their online offerings so folks do not just dump all their GE online.

Emily Asencio indicated potentially a new need to disentangle a course from an instructor: EPC has never before considered who is teaching the course and perhaps this is something that is newly in EPC's charge given that an instructor needs to have the training and approval for the online course.

Do we want to specific in the policy around the training component? Moving forward we will need to consider if this is something that is sustainable and therefore concrete enough to be included in the policy.