

EPC Meeting Minutes

Dec 3, 2015

11:00 – 12:50

Academic Affairs Conference Room

Present: Laura Watt (chair), Richard Whitkus, Melinda Milligan, Alvin Nguyen, Luisa Grossi, Tim Wandling, Kathryn Chang, Kristen Daley, Nathan Rank, Olivia Smith (arrived at noon)

Guests: Karen Thompson, Johanna Filp-Hanke, Steven Winter, Jennifer Shaw, Shannon Benine, Brian Wilson

Minutes prepared by Chiara Bacigalupa

I. LW called the meeting to order at 11:03 am.

II. Agenda approved with no comments or changes.

III. Revision to Business Administration Minor – Karen Thompson (TC 11:05)

KT described the purpose of the revision and catalog changes as follows: the purpose is to align the minor with major requirements, particularly the GPA entry requirement (require GPA of 2.5) and the grade requirement in the lower division courses (C or better). Additional proposed changes are 1) to let students know which forms are required for the minor and that they should turn in the forms to the department chair rather than a faculty advisor, 2) to clearly specify the required courses and sequence, and 3) to let students know that they can only expect to take one business course per semester (due to impaction).

Discussion of the proposal during the first reading included the following questions and answers:

A. LW: How does the one course per semester guideline work out in practice? KT: *Minors are permissioned in to courses, and the department will let them into courses if they are needed for graduation.*

B. AN: Are students able to take both 200-level courses at one time? KT: *No, because one course is a pre-req to the other.*

C. AN: Will students be able to complete the minor in four semesters? KT: *The department will help them to finish the minor in four semesters when necessary, but the department needs them to plan ahead as much as possible.*

D. MM: The sequence of steps in the catalog copy seems like it many need to be re-ordered. Steps 1-4, in particular, may need to be in another order. For example, perhaps declaring the minor should be #1. KT: *The department will take another look at the sequence and put it in a logical order.*

E. TW: Does the clarification about turning in the form mean that students need to meet with the chair or that they are just turning in the form to the chair? KT: *They just need to turn in the form to the chair.*

Kristen Daly made the motion to waive the first reading. Tim Wandling seconded the motion. This motion passed unanimously. The committee continued with the second reading.

NR asked that the proposal include the student learning outcomes so that the reader knows what they are and can see that the proposed changes do not affect them.

Melinda Milligan moved to approve the revisions to the Minor in Business Administration with the condition that the learning outcomes be added to the proposal and that the steps for declaring the minor be reordered in whatever way the department decides is appropriate. Kristen Daly seconded the motion. This motion passed unanimously.

IV. Revisions to and New Concentrations in Early Childhood Studies Major (TC: 11:15, Johanna Filp-Hanke and Chiara Bacigalupa)

CB recapped the main elements of the proposal: 1) to add two concentrations so that one education track can be accredited as an early childhood teacher preparation program and the second track can meet the needs of those students who want to work with young children in non-education settings; 2) to add courses that advisors currently approve as major electives to the catalog list so that advisors do not have to complete so many course substitution forms; and 3) to add a 1-unit introductory course that better prepares students for the capstone portfolio and for the professional expectations they will encounter in their field courses. JFH added: 1) there are no resource implications for the changes, since the department will adjust course offerings to accommodate the 1-unit course using the same number of FTES, and 2) the concentrations will better meet the needs of the 40% of ECS students who want to work in non-education settings.

MM added that she and CB had discussed over e-mail the questions that were raised last time regarding the sociology courses, and there are no implications for the sociology department.

Melinda Milligan moved to approve the proposed concentrations/revisions to the Early Childhood Studies Major. Kristen Daly seconded the motion. With no further discussion the motion was approved unanimously.

V. Approval of the minutes from the last two meeting (Oct 29 and Nov 12)

Changes to Oct 29 minutes:

- TW requested that the term “right” in his comments in 6.b.iv be changed to “traditional.”
- MM requested that the last names of the people present be added
- NR requested that in new business item 2.g., the language be clarified to reflect that he didn’t mean that EPC must should/must handle proposals in these ways, but that it has historically been forced to handle them in idiosyncratic ways.

The minutes for both meetings were approved with the changes above.

The committee briefly discussed whether meeting minutes need to be written verbatim or with a degree of specificity that matches the level seen in the last two sets. NR commented that Laurel has posted a set of guidelines for taking minutes [<http://www.sonoma.edu/senate/governance/prepmins.html>], which is a good place to start. MM commented that, as a past chair, she found the justifications and explanations to be useful. They do not have to be verbatim, but key information is helpful when someone needs to reconstruct the reasons for a decision or action.

VI. Discontinuance of two Kinesiology Concentrations, Adapted Physical Education and Physical Education (Steven Winter, 11:30 TC)

LW reminded the committee that SW consulted with EPC last year about whether discontinuance was an appropriate course of action.

SW summarized the proposal for discontinuance as follows: Over time, kinesiology majors at SSU have shifted from being interested in physical education careers to being more interested in health careers (occupational therapy, physical therapy, etc.). In addition, the kinesiology department no longer has TT faculty who specialize in adapted PE or Physical Education—the department made the decision in the last hiring round to select another exercise physiologist, because they do not have enough students to justify hiring a faculty member to specialize in physical education.

MM reminded the committee that the policy is very open-ended about how EPC handles next steps. Specifically, EPC can decide whether or not to seek opinions from stakeholders and the community. In addition, the Senate will look to EPC to provide a statement about how we see this discontinuance in the larger context of the university. EPC could, for example, provide a statement about resources.

The following points were raised during the discussion:

- A. SW commented that right now the School of Education has doubled the number of students interested in this specialization at the credential (post-bac) level (8 rather than 4), but they are coming to SSU from other areas and they might not intend to be hired/stay here. MM suggested that this information be added to the proposal.
- B. RW commented that if discontinuance is approved, he will need to provide a teach-out plan, and asked SW to provide a description of how the department will handle students who are currently in the program.
- C. KD asked when the discontinuance would start. LW said a decision would not be in time for the Fall 2016 catalog. The committee discussed whether a line could be put in the catalog to the effect that the department is no longer accepting students into this program. That approach has been discouraged in the past. SW noted that students have to apply to the (impacted) program, so the department has been advising them individually that these concentrations will no longer be an option.

D. TW and MM asked that the proposal address the discrepancy between the program review recommendation (the program review is quoted as recommending that the teacher education concentrations be maintained) and this request for discontinuance. In other words, why did the department decide to go in a different direction from the recommendation?

E. TW noted that whether or not the community wants the program will make little difference if there are no students in the program. He also asked whether there are students who are interested but perhaps have gone to other majors (such as Early Childhood Studies or Psychology), especially since Kinesiology is impacted. He further wondered who will now focus on the needs in the special education community (especially if the psychology autism program were to no longer be offered).

F. CB commented that the School of Education would prefer that the local school community be given an opportunity to comment on the discontinuance, and that the School of Ed is very sorry to see so many of the waiver programs (programs such as the PE concentration that streamlined the process for students to enter credential programs) disappear.

In the course of the discussion, a motion was made to have LW initiate a recommendation letter. However, that motion was later withdrawn, as the committee discussed the need to slow down and provide some kind of opportunity for more stakeholders to comment. A public meeting is not necessarily needed – comments could be collected online.

LW asked that SW make the additions to the proposal that were requested above. EPC will come up with a way to make the document public and solicit feedback. EPC will then make a recommendation after reading this input.

VI. Revision to Studio Art BA/BFA Photography emphasis (Jennifer Shaw and Shannon Benine, TC Noon)

JS and SB summarized the proposal as follows. The department needs to update the emphasis, particularly with regards to digital photography. They have already changed the intro to photography course and some other departmental changes, but those do not address all of their concerns. The proposal 1) unstacks the courses so that a greater variety of courses can be taught; 2) adds more special topics courses so that students have more options – this is especially important for today's career options; 3) gives students exposure to more software and the different possibilities within that software. The photo emphasis will have more units – due to the requirements for technical knowledge and the need for progressive education that needs to be more sequential. Specific changes include:

- Keeping the background courses that are required of all studio arts majors, but including fewer drawing requirements (one course instead of two)
- Moving introductory courses for photography to the lower division requirements. The idea is to have students make their mistakes with digital cameras, before they get into darkroom practices.

- Reducing the number of breadth requirements (relative to the other emphases), because photography is more technical and thus requires more time.
- Shifting upper division drawing courses to photography-specific courses that students need to fill current holes in the program (e.g. understanding light).
- Requiring that history of photography be included in art history (among other options).
- Adding some upper division courses that can also be taken by students in other emphases and other disciplines (e.g. communications).

The following points were raised during the discussion of this proposal:

- NR asked why so many more units are required for a BFA, as compared with a BA. JS answered that the BFA is considered a professional degree and is a precursor to an MFA program. BFA is actually a 5th year – this arrangement is standard across the profession and aligned with accreditation requirements.
- NR asked whether the graduation requirement is more elaborate for the BFA. JS answered that the BFA requires seminars and a show of the student's work. There is currently no formal requirement for a portfolio, but it is coming.
- TW asked whether the HLC (ART 160A/B) went through EPC. JS answered that it did.
- TW asked whether the art department anticipates that funding for the art history courses will be harder to get. JS answered that the department has agreed to teach ARTH 210 and 211 with 120-180 students and they get funded first – they fill a big need for C1.
- TW asked how ART 160A/B will be able to cover the art content and the A3/C1 content. JS offered to provide a syllabus to EPC, but added that it is really the assignments that show how all of the content is taught and assessed.
- MM noted that the title for ARTS 210 needs to be changed on the proposal. She also requested that the proposal include a statement of the financial implications of the proposal. The statement needs to explain that the increase in units does not cause additional need for facilities, faculty, and/or the number of courses to be mounted. Or, if additional resources are needed, then a statement from the Dean is needed to show that he will support the additional costs.
- RW asked why 20 units of electives are included when the requirements for the BFA are met with the required courses. JS responded that, for accreditation, 65% of the units in the degree have to come from art courses. SB added that the faculty want them to take some other art courses as well – they need those courses too in today's art world.

LW requested that the committee move on to the next agenda item. **This proposal will come back for a second reading.**

VIII. Revisions to Music Concentrations (Brian Wilson, TC 12:30)

BW summarized how the proposal was changed to address the points raised during the first reading. The new, introductory paragraph addresses the request for a summary, and the numbers of units were clarified in the side-by-side comparison tables.

The following points were raised during the discussion of this proposal:

- RW indicated a typo under the rationale in the music education concentration, the courses should be listed as two separate 1-unit courses.
- NR asked that the SLO section be expanded to specifically list the student learning outcomes all in one place and as full sentences.

Nathan Rank made the motion to approve the proposal to revise the music concentrations, with the condition that the typo is corrected and the information about the SLO's is added. Kristen Daly seconded. This motion was approved unanimously.

IX. Chair Report

A. LW attended a meeting of the University Program Review Subcommittee. The discussion focused on the charge of the subcommittee, and included the point that the task of reporting back to the department and to EPC seems to have been lost with the shift to the new structure. Also, the committee has had trouble making quorum. The UPRS suggested that the reporting task be given to APC or that the charge to UPRS be clarified. It also suggests that the task be specified in a way that makes it more relevant and leads to a concrete outcome. LW will meet with Rich Whitkus and Rich Senghas to discuss how this task should be specified and where it would fit best.

B. At the Senate Budget Subcommittee, David Crosier from financial services, explained why there were differences between the administration's budget report and the CFA audit. The difference mainly concerns how unrestricted funds are categorized. The terms "restricted" vs "unrestricted" refer to whether there is a non-CSU third party who is specifying where the funds can be spent. Unrestricted funds include subcategories called "designated funds," where there are designated purposes for those funds – they can only be spent on specific programs. The CFA audit was working with public data that did not include the internal accounting processes. This explanation does not answer all of the questions, so the subcommittee is still tracking down additional information. KD clarified that student fees are designated funds. TW commented that growth money is supposed to be allocated 74% to academic affairs, but it never has been.

X. Vice-Chair Report

NR studied other campuses to see how GE programs are approved. For five campuses, it is impossible to determine the GE process, twelve have a straight vertical approach, and four have various forms of consultation, including school input.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:50 pm.