Educational Policies Committee Meeting Minutes
March 7, 2013

Present: Armand Gilisnky (Chair): Christina Baker; Melinda Milligan; Mary Dingle; Elaine Newman; Carrie McDade; Lillian Lee; Carmen Works; Amy Kittlestrom; Jeffery Reeder; Carrie McDade (minutes); Elaine Sundberg (Liaison for Academic Programs)

Call to order 11:00aam
Agenda approved
Minutes from 2/21/13 approved
Minutes from 2/7/13 approved with correction: Carrie McDade, present

Report: EPC Chair (Armand Gilinsky)
No "real" report, but noted a few items for the Senate meeting later in the day …
- Senate will be looking at the course materials adoption policy (V. Montera); EN inquired if the policy had been revised to address the EPC committee's concerns about language that placed all of the burden on faculty; answer unclear at the time
- The Budget Subcommittee' will be delivering an Academic Affairs budget report today, which Margi Purser presented to AC earlier this week; anticipated to be "provocative; EN asked if this would have wider distribution; AG said he would follow up on this
- The role of the Diversity Subcommittee will be discussed, as will the loss of the faculty representative for diversity issues

New Business Item #1: Nursing 800 Certificate Proposal (Deb Roberts)
Deb Roberts presented this certificate proposal, first by providing some economic context and professional rationale (refer to the course description, narrative, and objectives circulated), and then by describing the SSU-Sutter Health relationship (e.g., no financial contributions to or from the latter; priority to SSU and five sister community college students, no open enrollment on a national scale). She further informed EPC that the School of Nursing curriculum committee had unanimously approved the proposal. Run through Extended Education, this program would transpire over 10 weeks and require a certificate fee of $2,000. A series of questions followed:

- MD: How will the general plan map to specific areas?
  - DR: The core curriculum does not differ with each specialized area; specialized areas covered by assigned preceptor
- CW: It seems a "privileged" program in that it is only available to those who can pay the $2,000.
  - DR: Not ideal, but true.
- AG: Would this certificate program be recorded / count as CEUs (continuing education credits) for nurses?
  - DR: Yes.
- AG: How will changes in the nursing labor force affect this program?

- DR: Presently, there is a "false" demand for nursing; presently late-profession nurses are continuing to work, thus filling the demand in a more cost-effective way for health care organizations and making it more challenging for new grads to enter the field, given their limited hands-on experience. As the market changes, so too will the need for programs like this. Hence, the School is looking at this proposal as a 3-year strategy; they will revisit then.

EN raised the motion to approve as a Business Item, first reading; CW seconded the motion; motion was approved unanimously. EN then moved to approve the second reading; MD seconded the motion; motion was approved unanimously. Discussion of where this proposal goes next ensued:
- AG not entirely clear; to Ex Comm, Senate, send on as approved?
- ES referred to the old curriculum guide, which stipulates that individual CEU courses need only be approved by relevant department.
- ES also suggested that since this was a certificate program, best to engage due diligence at the department level as well as with through EPC review; no need to go further
- EN endorsed EPC's role in reviewing certificate programs regardless of credit / non-credit status given that both will have the SSU name attached; suggested EPC draft a memo to Extended Education affirming the committee's review and approval with similar communication going on to Senate
- MD raised the question of what would happen if EPC did not approve a certificate proposal?
  - AG: EPC role should be "guide dog" not "watch dog"
  - ES: faculty at EPC could provide oversight on issues such as certificates closely related to existing programs (e.g., minor degrees)
  - EN: in favor of EPC's oversight role so things are not pushed to "revenue" side from the academic side
- Discussion also brought up the issue of state-side certificates and campus precedents (e.g., accounting, nursing family practice, counseling)

New Business Item #2: Proposed approval form for new certificate programs
Discussion of the form …
- CW: Asked what was meant by "Total Units" – a suggestion was to replace this with "Total Credit Units"—this evolved further to "Total & Type of Credit Units" to account for academic CEU
- CW: Asked what was meant by "Pilot" and "Pilot Conversion" – ES explained that piloting a degree program is not generally done but that it is an option – it was recommended that these are not necessary and should be removed from the form
- MD: Asked about where to indicate multi-departmental proposals – it was suggested that this was covered in the "note" of #2 under "Details" ("Any portion of this new certificate proposal that involves another department or school …."); though a suggestion was also made under the "Initial Questions" section – "**Academic** Unit**(s)** with Primary Responsibility"

- CW: Asked about the section "Resource Statement," specifically does this address revenue-generation motive? Proposed edits in this section included:
  - Move the "note" copy from #2 under "Details" to "Resource Statement"
  - Rework the statement "Or attach a statement that considers the following" to better transition from the checkbox statement about "no changes" … something to the effect of "If changes in Department of School resources are required, then please attach a statement …"
  - A suggestion was also made to include wording that addressed self-supporting with something like: "If this is a self supporting certificate program, then please attach documentation from Extended Education" … though it was also suggested that the timing for this might not be right.
- Other recommended changes:
  - Under "Certificate Type" section – "~~Elevation~~ Change of Option or Concentration to Certificate Program"
  - Under "Certificate Type" section – add "Other. Please describe."
  - On the "Signature Sheet" – insert "If State Supported, then the following signatures are required" above "Chair of the Faculty for the Academic Senate"

New Business Item #3: Change MATH 161X from experimental to permanent (GE B4)
- Moved to email discussion/vote (discussion turned to the following Old Business Item)

Old Business Item: Changes to MCCCF (second reading)
EN presented the committee with a suggested revision to the MCCCF that explicitly numbered the routing order for signatures and distinguished between "faculty approval" and "administrative review." The discussion about this proposal brought up the following points:
- The numbering of the form is confusing.
- The changes may be perceived as "less than collegial.
- The form doesn't actually reflect the process; further clarification is needed.
- Key questions: To what extent do CS codes matter? What happens when signatures are not forthcoming? EPC has authority to override the lack of a Dean's signature.
- There are other venues / means for resolving problems.
- This form is merely a transmission to registrar. The process must be addressed if clarification is needed and problems resolved.

The majority conclusion seemed to be that while there is a process problem and possibly other conflicts with moving forward with new courses, the MCCCF is not the most effective forum for addressing.

Meeting adjourned, 12:50pm.

Respectfully submitted by: Carrie McDade