

EPC Minutes – Nov 10, 2016

PRESENT: Melinda Milligan (MM), John Palmer (JP), Andy Wallace (AW), Kathryn Chang (KC), Alvin Nguyen (AN), Luisa Grossi (LG), Chiara Bacigalupa (CB), Tia Watts (TWs), Jennifer Lillig (JL), Diana Grant (sub for Patrick Jackson), Briana Taggart (BT)

ABSENT: Karen Moranski (KM)

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA:

- Pull SSCI 320 to the business item

Approved the agenda with the change

Approved two sets of minutes

I. REPORTS

Chair of EPC (MM)

- APARC and its Program Review Subcommittee are looking at policy changes. One of proposals is to remove School Program Review Committee.
- Process for the WIC course. There is a recommendation that imposes a limit on signing students to give seniors the priority. Need to check with the department first before implementing it.

Louisa reported the status about program review and assessment related to WASC.

II. CONSENT ITEMS

Non-GE MCCCCF's listed on Moodle – not visited

Business items

1. MCCCCF SSCI 320 New Course (1 unit at the school level). It is a social science upper division special topic course that will be offered in Spring 2017. There is a discussion about whether or not this course needs to list learning objectives explicitly (AW, CB, MM, JL). Recommendation: ask the department to make a statement about the purpose of this course.

III. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

1. ITDS (Minor, BA, BS, MA, MS) Revision to Existing Program (L. McCabe, A. Boutin)

AB: Problems with current ITDS undergraduate program: 1) Students have difficulty to enroll in courses they want because of increased number of impacted majors/courses; 2) Students have hard time to complete the program because of lack of mentoring by faculty committee member.

The revision centers on changing ITDS from student-designed to faculty-designed program to address these problems.

LM: Graduate program faces similar problems. The revision made changes to all aspects of MA, including prerequisite, acceptance requirements. Basically asking students do a lot of work before entering the program (reference to the document for specific changes). Currently, we have one student in the program, sort of beta testing the proposal.

DISCUSSION:

TW: Having a faculty design, cohort based program is a good idea. Wondering how much buy-in from the department because it involves a lot of work with no compensation? LM: it is a concern as this would be considered as an overload with no extra compensation. AB confirmed it will be an overload.

JP pointed out KM's comments on page 3 of the EPC form. MM suggested exploring it in the 2nd reading with input from Michaela Groebbel.

MM moved to second readings (on 12/1) with the suggestion to update the document (e.g. approval date, recent changes).

2. MPA (Revision to Existing Program) (C. Nelson, E. Ray)

ER: The current program requires a thesis or comprehensive exam. We looked other programs in other institutions; many also have a capstone project with very positive student feedback. The revised program will add a MPA capstone project for students as one of culminating experiences of the program. Students will work with their chosen track (public or NP) agency to apply theories to address an issue, problem or project. Students are required to defend their work before the committee and the agency.

CN: The issue of workload for the MPA Coordinator was raised by Graduate Study. The Coordinator will be given 4 units of course release.

AW asked whether the capstone project would be internship-based experience. ER: could be but not necessary. CN: it would be more than an internship experience. The project should have the literature / theory support to address the issue for the agency. JL suggested that the presentation of the project could be opened to the campus community. CB suggested copying the learning objectives in the course outline as well. The 598 course proposal is with the revision (MM).

JL moved to wave 1st reading and moved to 2nd reading, CB second. JL moved to approve, JP seconded. Unanimously approved.

IV. OLD BUSINESS ITEMS

1. Revision to Academic Probation, Disqualification, and Progress Policy (M. Jolly)

MJ: At the first reading, EPC suggested to find out to what extent the graduate study reviewed this revision. We found the old correspondences and showed that GSS had circulated the revision – details on Moodle.

MJ discussed the impact of this revision. The old policy that letting students come back with only mid-term grade failed. Under new policy, students would have to be gone a full year. With reapplication, it means they would be gone 3 semesters - actually reapply to SSU.

MM suggested clarifying the new policy by making specific side-by-side comparison, striking through old policy where applicable to get it ready for the Senate.

JP moved the revision policy with readiness changes to Ex Comm. JL seconded. Unanimously approved.

2. Reorganization Proposal: Creation of Geography, Environment, and Planning Department previous ENSP & GEOG/GLBL (R. Laney)

Laney clarified questions raised from the first reading related to 1) impaction status quo; and 2) GE subcommittee was informed.

JL moved to approve, CB seconded. Unanimously approved.

3. ENSP, Geography, & Global Studies (Revision to current program) (R. Laney)

EPC did not see any curriculum issues in the revision.

JL moved to approve the revision, JP seconded. Unanimously approved.

V. PUBLIC HEARING: Water Resources Management Concentrations, ENSP BA & BS, Discontinuance Proposals

MM: The role of EPC is to make the recommendation (for or against), based on the evidence included in the pack, to the Senate.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

MM mentioned that public comments are on EPC Moodle page.

Claudia Luke, Director of Center for Environmental Inquiry at SSU, expressed her concern related to discontinuance of Water Management Program. Specifically, what would be the

impact of such discontinuance on SSU long-term partnership with water agency, cross-campus water engagement projects (currently at 20-25 projects), and students career related to the water track. The newly merged department and its curriculum should specifically address how SSU strengths and partnerships in water management will be maintained.

Norwick family also voiced their dismay at the proposal to discontinue the water program at SSU out of concerns for climate change and negative impact on students' internship opportunity and career path related to the program. Sara Norwick mentioned that the family's previous intent to support the program by providing partial support for the Chair was going nowhere.

DISCUSSION:

TW suggested that Soto investigating the news about Norwick's endowment intent mentioned above for further consideration. Soto suggested it may take a long time and offered to possibly add it in the document. Laura Watt explained that lack of tenure hire was the main reason behind the proposal because the department was not able to offer these courses over past couple of years. There was a discussion among EPC members about a possible interdisciplinary degree program / or certification across departments (e.g. newly formed department and chemistry department) to provide options for students interested in the Water Management career. Claudia and Norwick family appeared to be supportive of such direction. MM suggested that EPC to recommend the discontinuance of Water Management Program with a strong statement. AW supported it and pointed out that resource allocation should be the problem between the department and the dean.

JL moved to recommend the discontinuance of Water Resources Management Concentrations, ENSP BA & BS with a strong statement, which will be electronically crafted and approved by majority of EPC members before moving to the Senate. BT seconded. JP opposed. Approved.

Meeting adjourned at 12:55 pm
Minutes submitted by Kathryn Chang