

## **EPC Meeting Minutes May 14, 2015**

**EPC Members Present:** Melinda Milligan (MM), Armand Gilinsky (AG), Laura Watt (LW), Patricia Kim-Rajal (PKR), Chiara Bacigalupa (CB), Nathan Rank (NR), Tim Wandling (TW), Christian George (CG), Alvin Nguyen (AN), Felicia Kalker (FK)

**EPC Members Absent:** Jack Ou (JO)

**Also Present:** Jeremy Qualls (JQ)

**Call to Order** at 11:05 am

**Changes to Agenda:** Add new item #1 to Old Business, continue discussion of resolution to Academic Senate regarding the need for more tenure-track hires

**Approval of Agenda:** Approved by consent

**Approval of Minutes from April 30:** meeting minutes approved with following corrections:

- Alvin Nguyen was present
- LW would like to amend her comment under item 3 “We had roughly 280 in 2009/10 and are down to 210 in Fall 2014”

### **Reports**

1. Chair of EPC —M. Milligan. Thanks to committee members for participation. Thanks and farewell to Armand Gilinsky for his service, especially as chair. Welcome to Laura Watt as new chair. Submitted a request to Executive Committee for an additional course release for EPC in 2015-16 to take account of the work the committee is doing while APC is on hiatus. Release would be granted to somebody to take the lead in addressing policy and planning tasks within the committee—see list on my proposal of working groups that address planning. Discussion at the start of fall semester on who would be interested in a release and what the committee wants to do in terms for planning.

TW: I think a course release is more valuable than a stipend. Would it be for Spring 2016 then? I would be interested but I am already spoken for

NR: Is there a release for the GE chair? There used to be and it was very valuable. I think the lack can mean that things get to us with less vetting and it can increase workload for everyone

MM: I agree workload for GE is ridiculous, as it is for program review, and a course release would be valuable

One thing to be expecting on the horizon is a major review of Hutchins.

NR: I want to ask about whether the working group on curriculum guide is going to be meeting over the summer? I am asking this because I was concerned about the process when the changes to UNIV 150B were approved and the opportunity that was given to people from other schools to comment. This change affects many of our majors and we didn't really get much of a chance to weigh in on it. I discussed with John. The process for review to University courses needs to be made clear within curriculum guides.

MM: Certainly that would be something to consider

NR: I just don't want to see this issue dropped

2. AVP, Academic Programs and Graduate Studies — E. Sundberg. Not present. No report
3. Liaison to Graduate Studies Subcommittee —P. Kim-Rajal. No report.
4. Liaison to GE Subcommittee — T. Wandling. No report.
5. Liaison to/from APC — IN HIATUS
6. Voting member of Program Review Subcommittee — F. Palsson (non-voting)
7. Liaison to/from Senate Budget Subcommittee — Vacant
8. Liaison from Senate Diversity Subcommittee – C. Elster (Occ. Report)
9. Liaison to University Standards - Vacant

### **Consent Items**

1. Various MCCCfs [see Moodle]: Approved

## **New Business**

1. UPRS Report (J. Qualls) [Moodle and attached] **TC 11:30**

JQ: I am here to present the end of year report from the University Program Review Subcommittee. We have a lot of programs coming through now and GSS is doing the graduate programs. The Senate Diversity Subcommittee has proposed a revision to the diversity issues raised on the self-study template. One major concern is that many of the members in the committee will be leaving. There is no overlap in terms and I think this will have an effect. This year we reviewed five programs: Economics, Napa Liberal Studies, Nursing, Sociology, and History. I want to highlight some of the common themes we have seen across programs. We are worried that these are becoming such a pattern that we will become desensitized to it. The common themes we found among all program reviews are:

- Lack of Resources to Address Needs: We are really seeing a state of attrition. All programs need faculty across the board. Many programs have had to either remove classes or staff their classes with part-time faculty, which is impacting their ability to address needs of upper-division students
- Assessment of Student Learning: Programs are assessing student satisfaction but they are not necessarily looking at whether students are meeting learning objectives. When they measure those they tend to rely on built-in assessments or final papers with the assumption that students who complete the course have met those learning objectives. It is binary, you either meet them or you don't. We would like to see a more direct measurement of how well students are achieving learning outcomes. There is also some concern that the outcomes of these assessments are being circulated back to the department and leading to any actions.
- Curricular Goals and Innovations: Concern that these are being more driven by concerns about resources rather than by pedagogy.

We recommend more support and development for programs undergoing program review. Make an exemplary program review available online as a model and develop an infrastructure to provide faculty doing program review with training, standards, expectations, and education.

FK: Last year when we had this meeting the Provost was here and we talked about software and other tools that are available to collect this data. We also talked about making a template and links to tools available online

MM: I think this is something that we can make a recommendation on. As far as online, I was under the impression that there was something available there

JQ: There are some resources online, like a template but, for example, the tools for measuring student learning outcomes and even diversity are not there

FK: Last year, much like this year, we had a list of fairly specific action items. I think Elaine has too much that she is in charge of to address this as well. I think we should have a dedicated assessment officer on this campus to address this.

NR: How much support is there to measure student enrollment?

JQ: It varies by department but most of them track number of majors but not necessarily when and how students enroll or end up dropping the program

NR: It seems like that would be a place where additional institutional support would be useful in terms of getting those numbers from institutional research

MM: As a department chair, I can tell you that it is really hard to get that information

NR: I can get it based on raw data but I do it myself and it took me three years to learn how to do it

TW: I disagree with Felicia. I don't think we need a dedicated assessment person, I think we need to hire professional administrators who work with faculty to produce these program reviews. This is too much for faculty members to do for either course release or a flat fee.

AG: I think this need to be part of the EPC chair's year-end report. I think that these recommendations need to be brought to the Executive Committee so that they can take action on them. I don't have an opinion on whether faculty should be doing them or whether an administrator should be writing them but I do think that the recommendations need to be highlighted. Also a change in language to first sentence under "Consequences of Limited Resources" where you raise the alarm regarding lack of tenure track hires.

MM: Jeremy you will have an opportunity to tighten up the language in this report and to prioritize the recommendations you would like to highlight as important to take action on. I also want you to know that I have excerpted a paragraph from your report that I plan to present as an EPC

JQ: I think that there is a lack of resources and information for programs as they write these reviews. There is a need to build a culture of assessment and the idea that these reviews are getting done just to meet an internal administrative need. We need to close the loop so that departments can see that the goal of the program review is not just to drop it off but to have a meeting regarding how the needs of the department can be met

MM: I think maybe next year we can have more specific language regarding scheduling meetings as a result of this. Programs were meant to meet with the Provost to discuss the program review but then these meetings started to get pushed back to the Dean

TW: We just did our program review this year. It is a really useful process of self-reflection, not just a way to generate a pile of paper. However, I am not so sure that assessing learning outcomes is as important as ensuring that students have certain experiences while they are here, like spending time in a lab, or having their work not be graded by other undergraduates

AG: The problem is that the nature of assessment has changed from "how to we make our programs more effective" to "how to we make our programs more efficient," and so faculty are suspicious that program review has turned into a process of "how do we do more with less and still meet certain outcomes". We need to revise our philosophy regarding what the goal of assessment is.

NR: I think this goes back to recommendation from program review subcommittee is that we need to get better training on defining and assessing learning outcomes. I think the two issues can be integrated together if people know more about how to do it. I agree that it is overwhelming to develop and assess these learning outcomes but I think that we can get better at it with some training and actually improve students' experiences.

## 2. ENSP Water Resources Management Concentration Discontinuance Consultation (L. Watt)

LW: Attrition of full time faculty means that our water study plan is really struggling. I have been doing advising on interim basis but I am not an expert. We don't have faculty who can teach our two water specific courses. We had been using adjunct but due to budget squeeze we cannot offer any classes to our water student next semester. We are not sure what to do. Do we keep offering it to force administration to note lack of resources or do we take it off the books, discontinue it? I

would make the argument that, even when we can offer the coursework, it is not a program unless we have a coordinator that can knit together the courses with advising, capstone, lecture series, etc. We are also struggling with the planning program, which has also lost a TT faculty member and is heavily dependent on lecturers. It is another program that is on the verge of not functioning any more if we cannot get lecturer support. Given this, we are just not certain what to do as a department. I am coming to alert you to this fact and also seeking feedback.

AG: How many majors do you have? How many are in the water concentration program?

LW: We have between 260 and 300 majors depending on when the count happens. Of those 25-30 are in water concentration program. It is shrinking, in large part because it is not working. I have been alerting students to possibility that certain classes will not be offered so numbers are dropping.

AG: I just find it odd to have this issue come up, since this program has been touted as a jewel in crown of SSU. Also given the fact that water is becoming such an important subject. I would consider that there are some far-reaching implications about not being able to educate our students about this

TW: Well said. I want to ask when we, as a University, get to decide what to prioritize? We have had three programs come through this year—the Human Development reorganization, the Nursing discontinuance, and now about this.

MM: We the reorganization we approved for Human Development had to do with curriculum. The decision to allocate them a hire was made at the administrative level—the Dean granted a hire that will take responsibility for administering the program for those majors.

TW: Would a hire of that sort make this program more viable for you?

LW: Right now this study plan has 30 students

AG: That's ten percent of your students

TW: So should hiring be driven by student demand or by our values and priorities as a University?

MM: Part of the dilemma is that faculty is charged with the curriculum but they are not charged with the resources or resource allocation decisions. This is why Human Development got a line even when the School of Social Sciences curriculum committee recommended discontinuance. The Dean and Provost stepped in and decided to fund a hire based, in part, on student demand.

NR: I was just at a water conference. Water conservation is only one aspect of the field

LW: True. We would not be able to cover everything, certainly.

NR: Are you committed to a water hire? Would you consider merging it into another concentration? If that is your commitment, discontinuance would get the administration's attention and, possibly, get somebody to step in.

AG: I am very unhappy that we don't have an APC committee that doesn't prioritize funding like this. I am also unhappy about having program decisions being made on the basis on student demand. You should build a great program that can attract students, not fund existing program because there is student interest there.

CG: I think that the possibility of merging the water program into another one is a really interesting one, it seems sustainable.

LW: Getting some feedback has been very helpful. I also wanted to formally put this on your radar.

## **Old Business**

### **1. Report to the Academic Senate on Curricular Impact on Continuing Resource Reductions**

MM: Goal is to draw Senate's attention to the effect that proposed faculty hire reductions will have on curriculum. I have a TC and will be presenting, with your approval. Evidence I will be using: Program revisions submitted due to resource constraints, program discontinuance consultations, and recommendations for program review assessment. What do you think about me bringing this today? Are there any changes you would like to see to it if that were to happen?

NR: I think something else to add to this document is a list of programs that are now considering impaction due to lack of resources. We are limiting enrollment in certain programs at a time when the campus is growing. This is just moving students around, it is a band aid on the problem but it does not fix them. I would also maybe address the language in the "resounding alarm to a universal cry" sentence from Jeremy's report.

TW: I would like to see the phrase "alignment of resources" included in the first paragraph of this report. I would also bring up advising ratios on basis of number of faculty vs. number of students.

FK: For your first bullet point, I think a pie chart might be effective. It took me reading all the way through to realize that half the program revisions had been driven by lack of faculty.

MM: Maybe I can move the sentence that states that up to the top of the section

FK: I like the idea that we need to build great programs to attract students. We need make some statement about our mission as a University in terms of funding programs

AG: I would like to strengthen last sentence on page two as follows: "We urge budget priorities can be changed so that additional tenure-track hiring can be made."

TW: I think that there are several historical Senate resolutions that we are echoing here. I can send you the links to the 55% resolution and the one that Art Warmouth and Elaine McDonald wrote in 2006 (Resolution for Core Priorities).

LW: We thought we might want to have this as a report at the end of the year and then try and craft it into a resolution next academic year.

MM: I want it to be concise at this point and not rely on lots of statistics that can be debated. I really want to emphasize the point. The Senate has already passed a resolution regarding this issue. I want to provide evidence to ensure that this conversation continues next year

NR: I don't know about faculty numbers but student numbers can be accessed using CSU website.

MM: So it sounds that there is support. I appreciate the comments and Laura and I will try to incorporate them as best we can. If anyone thinks of anything we can fix over the next hour so please email us. Should I list all programs and just bold the ones where revisions were driven by internal constraints?

AG: We should do it. Maybe change the language to make it clear that the revisions in bold was in direct response to lack of resources and let other programs chime in if they felt that drove their own revisions.

NR: I still think that impaction is something departments are doing to cope with this and it is something that should be noted.

TW: I know this is about curriculum and departments but I also feel that we are not doing student-centered enrollment either. We are not restricting students to 16 units for anything other than budgetary reasons, it is not because it meets student needs.

NR: The cap is another band aid for lack of resources

MM: And it creates a problem for continuing students.

Meeting adjourns 12:50 PM

Minutes respectfully submitted by Patricia Kim-Rajal