

Educational Policies Committee

Minutes for September 15, 2005

Members present: Perry Marker (Chair), Steve Bittner, Sharon Cabaniss, Mary Halavais, Lynne Morrow, Vincent Richman, Marci Sanchez, Thaine Stearns, Elaine Sundberg, Carmen Works, Lynne Morrow, Lindsey Simoncic (AS rep.), Rick Robison (recorder).

Members absent: none

Agenda approved.

Minutes approved.

REPORTS

Chair of EPC – Trying to clarify voting issues. Documents addressed: Senate By-Laws Section 3.9 “Attendance and proxies” and Section 3.5.1 and 3.5.2 regarding student representation and voting rights on committees. At present, students should have no voting rights on committees. (PM)

Discussion of student voting rights added to agenda as business item. (MH, PM)

Currently, committee liaisons have voting rights. Robison volunteered to serve as liaison to APC. Stearns also volunteered to assist when needed.

Graduate Studies Subcommittee – Discussed WASC Institutional proposal. (MH)

General Education Subcommittee – GE is in hiring process. 15 names forwarded to Provost.

Provost consulted with Paul Draper and Sascha Von Meier on these 15. Provost recommended 10 (8 full-time with 2 alternates). It was noted that all instructors hired for GE pilot were already employed by SSU. (MS)

Teacher Education Council – New Dean rethinking purpose/mission of this council. (PM)

Senate Budget Committee – Richman has perfect attendance. Discussed possible future speaker; defined role as an information sharing committee. (VR)

Request was made by Halavais for this committee to gather and share budget figures concerning GE Pilot Program. Richman said he would request this information but cautioned regarding the complexities involved in analyzing the numbers.

BUSINESS

1) Program Review Policy

Historical context for this policy document was provided as well as current options for revision and implementation of this policy: 1) EPC can take action to revise policy, or 2) an interim policy can and will be implemented by the Administration. The President gave faculty 30 days to revise document before an Interim Policy would be put in place (deadline: Oct. 8, 2005). (PM)

Primary issue was use of the word “will” in sentence on p. 2: “Resources for the assessment and program review will be provided by the Division of Academic Affairs.”

Administration’s position is that faculty cannot command use of resources from administration. President will not sign with current language. (PM)

Provost submitted language to replace 1st and 2nd paragraph on page 2 that was noted to be “acceptable” to the President.

A lengthy discussion of this new language, the intentions of the old language, and suggestions for revisions ensued. It was accepted to work from the new language submitted by the Provost.

Motion: by Morrow to insert language: “The University recognizes that program review and ongoing program assessment, in economic terms, are investments in the future of the University.”
Seconded by Works.

Motion passes unanimously.

Language from 1st paragraph of new language, “As such it is a long-standing practice in higher education” removed. No objections were raised. (MH, All)

Motion: by Morrow to strike last sentence of 2nd paragraph of “new” language. Seconded by Sanchez.
Rescinded by Morrow and Sanchez.

Motion: by Halavais to replace paragraphs 1 and 2 on page 2 of original document with:

“Program review is a periodic process that incorporates the findings of ongoing program assessment and focuses attention on specific areas for program improvement. It is mandated by the CSU Board of Trustees and by WASC accreditation standards. Detailed assessment of learning outcomes, however, is a relatively new dimension of overall program review, one that may require a higher level of resources than review of traditional input-based quality measures, particularly in the initial cycle. The University recognizes that program review and ongoing assessment, in economic terms, are investments in the future of the University

Therefore, departments, working in conjunction with the department chairs and school deans, will identify resource needs, such as the need for faculty time to develop and conduct assessment activities and the need for the use of an outside evaluator of the program self-study, in order to meet the requirements of program review and assessment of student learning.”

Motion seconded by Morrow.

Motion approved – 8 votes for; 2 abstentions.

Motion: by Halavais to make this a second reading. Seconded by Morrow

Motion approved – 9 votes for; 1 abstention.

ACTION: Program Review Policy forwarded to Academic Senate for approval.

2) WASC Institutional Proposal – comments from EPC

Overall, a very thorough job but some concerns regarding diversity and how we define diversity.

We should be looking at all dimensions involved. (MS)

Recognition and applause from EPC to all those that put in the hard work to complete this document. (MH, All)

Concern that document does not specifically mention the professional schools (Nursing, Business, Education). (PM)

3) Student Representation and Voting Rights

It was reported that the Associated Students passed a resolution advocating for student voting rights on committees. (LS)

It was agreed by all that future discussion would occur after all had read the resolution.