

## **EPC Meeting Minutes February 4, 2016**

**EPC Members Present:** Chiara Bacigalupa (CB), Nathan Rank (NR), Alvin Nguyen (AN), Tim Wandling (TWe), Melinda Milligan (MM), Laura Watt (LW), Tia Watts (TWc), Kristen Daley (KD), Kathryn Chang (KC)

**EPC Members Absent:** Felicia Kalker (FK), Olivia Smith (OS), Luisa Grossi (LG)

**Also Present:** Rich Whitkus (RW)

**Call to Order** at 11:06 am

**Approval of Agenda (approved by consent)**

**Approval of Minutes**

**Approval of Minutes from 12/17 meeting (conditioned on adding CB to attendees)**

### **Reports**

1. Chair of EPC — L. Watt

GE discussions. Heather Smith will visit today to discuss GE. Question about whether to conduct GE program review this year. Proposed reconfiguration of Academic Planning Committee (APC) discussed at Executive Committee meeting this year. Discussions about SETE implementation problems for new electronic SETEs. Discussions about RTP policy revision and implementation.

2. Interim AVP, Academic Programs — R. Whitkus
3. Vice-Chair of EPC — N. Rank
4. Liaison to Graduate Studies Subcommittee — Vacant
5. Liaison to GE Subcommittee — T. Wandling
6. Liaison to/from APC — IN HIATUS
7. Voting member of Program Review Subcommittee — L. Krier/F. Kalker
8. Liaison to/from Senate Budget Subcommittee — L. Watt
9. Liaison from Senate Diversity Subcommittee — C. Elster (Occ. Report)
10. Liaison to University Standards — Vacant

### **Consent Items**

1. Various non-GE MCCCfFs – Moodle

### **Discussion Items**

11:15 Visit by Heather Smith (HS) to discuss GE

Followed up discussion from faculty retreat

Generated hand out of program strengths and weaknesses

What changes might we make in GE program?

HS-Weaknesses include cafeteria approach. Students don't understand how parts of curriculum fit together. Messages we give about GE amplify problems. TW- Students perceive system as so complex that they need to stay extra semesters to satisfy GE requirements. MM- may have to do with bottlenecks. NR- this is not as much a Biology problem. MM- not Sociology either. TW- English majors may have trouble. Student didn't understand why a specific course didn't meet the learning outcomes for an area. TW-course availability to non-majors fluctuates. What does that mean? HS- some courses have moved away from original focus but are still in the course pattern. LW- some courses in our pattern don't fit into the place where they reside. KD- What does the Chico State GE pattern look like? TW- greater range of courses that could fit into pathways. Could use GE as a mini-field of study. KD- Univ of Washington had similar pathways. HS- Menu version for those who choose it, and pathways for some. Concerns about needs to staff GE program with coordinators. Also, difficult to teach a specialized course in a GE framework. TW- SSU original plan was to take a core and a capstone. Middle part of program would open up to be breadth requirements. Faculty groups come together to teach courses that meet breadth requirements. We do not have person-power to staff this right now. LW- at retreat we started with question of what students need in the 21st century. Larger understanding of world. Ability to evaluate sources of information, etc. It's hard to reconcile this with breadth nature of the program. NR- we are not periodically evaluating curriculum. MM- Elaine Sundberg's feeling was that it would be too painful to make changes. Political problems. TWc- first weakness that program is too complicated. Most CS students learn as problem solvers. Don't care for the reading and memorizing components of many GE courses. Resentment towards GE is widespread. Departments sit down and think about what they want from GE package. How do we sell that to majors? Gap in information science. TWe- suggests a

pathway approach. Focus on certification and assessment of core courses within GE but let the rest of the pattern serve as a breadth requirement. LW- Students don't know what to do here. RW- What are you going to do? Seems like GE program is unpopular. What are we going to do to move forward? TWc- Everytime we go through process of getting new GE courses has been a nightmare. Discourages process of change. We won't activate change as long as we feel like it's hopeless. RW- administrators cant do this? NR- arc of discussion about GE back to where it was 2000. TWe- Don't want departments that we see as central to institution to be eliminated as part of GE reform. HS- current program can be simplified. Messaging can be improved. Pathways may be discussed. Committee memberships change. Do we need more discipline exposure or more breadth? TWe- faculty-wide referendum on it? TWc- Observes that some programs depend on GE courses, which are bound to specific instructors. RW- executive order is not adhered to. Why do we have a curriculum that is more complicated than that.

Close out of GE discussion- LW What do we want the GE Subcommittee to do? TWc- Could the GE Subcommittee to submit a one page summary view of how they see the GE curriculum? TWe- sounds like a good idea. MM- hard to imagine how departments would respond. Perhaps they should see some options. TWc- Not sure they agree with that. Puts choices into a box. MM- two step process. What models? NR- I would like GE Subcommittee to decide whether they are doing program review. Also to ask them to attend AACU meetings. KD- Nice to see departments dream and imagine how might that fit into models that fit executive order. CB- What are students learning from GE. Ask departments how they are consulting with students. TWe- Invite people from Chico State here to talk with us here.

1. Check-in on EPC Working Groups did not happen

## **Old Business**

1. Public hearing for proposed discontinuance of two Kinesiology concentrations (S. Winter) – Moodle **12:20 TC**

Steve Winter and Elaine McHugh (EM, FERP program) visit for this discussion.

LW- Santa Rosa teacher wrote to express disappointment about cancelling the SSU program in Adaptive Physical Education program. The teacher praises Dr. McHugh by name. From Danielle Taylor, specialist in PE at Santa Rosa City Schools.

EM- Hired 20 years ago to teach adaptive PE. Pipeline in the past has been through PE credential. Bill Silva has found physical educators all over our county. Sad to see how program has declined. Few strong programs left. EM would prefer that we would keep program on books. Starting up again is a monumental task. Understanding is that we have to have it or not have it. Unfortunately it looks like we will not have it. Speaks to Adaptive Physical Education. Misunderstanding out there that there will be no Adaptive PE courses. Lately inquiries are coming in from community for the added authorization for children with disabilities. Will try to propose adaptive PE program authorization courses. EM hopes for support from EPC for such courses. Good lecturer in program now.

TWe- This presentation helped to understand reasons for discontinuance. Glad to hear that adaptive PE curriculum is not going away. Good planning is going on and they should be publicized.

SW- facing challenge of how to make important elements continue.

TWc- Waves of students come and go. Do you think the current ebb will continue?

EM- Steady decline last 10 years, coinciding with declines at some other CSU programs. Many students seem to be more interested in Physical Therapy. Hope to keep elements of program.

MM- There are no comments from administrators. LW- checked on this and they really have nothing to say.

SW- thought we already had first and second readings.

MM- no readings are required. This is the public reading.

TWe- Our statements should reflect resource needs of program. We would like to see support for courses needed for adaptive authorization.

MM- we can according to policy ask the Dean for clarification.

NR- likes the idea.

SW- Dean would approach School of Education because the program would be a service to people in that school. Trying to get program off books so that students don't come here expecting programs that don't exist. They are separate issues and they involve multiple schools.

MM- EPC should help explain the issues involved and add transparency to the process. So the President sees that multiple schools must commit to program.

SW- Added authorization in School of Education is a separate issue.

LW- Can work this into letter from EPC.

TWc- Our document can include rationale for not keeping program on books.

Meeting adjourned at 12:54 PM.

Minutes submitted by Nathan Rank.