

## **Minutes for Educational Policies Committee Meeting**

Held 9-28-06

**Members present:** Mary Halavais (MH)-Chair, Steve Bitner (SB)-History, Rick Robison (RR)-Library, Carol Blackshire-Belay (CBB)-Vice Provost, Sharon Cabannis (SB)-Math, Thaine Stearns-English, Lynne Morrow (LM)-Music, Kirsten Ely (KE)-SBE

Meeting called to order at 10:55am

Agenda approved as amended

Minutes approved

### **Agenda Item 1.** October 16 Visit and the Vice-Provost's report

CBB passed out a summary of the Progress Report and passed around one copy of the full document (which is on line). She gave the background for the report.

- June: the President requested a progress report

- CBB gathered together what had been done to create the report

- #7 on the report still needs to be done => the Deans need to determine how to provide the link

LM: Is the link different from tracking?

CBB: It is just to provide the logistics of navigation and is CSU mandated. The deadline for doing this is October 10.

CBB indicated EPC expectations for the meeting with the 2 members of the Visit Team 10/16, 1-1:30 possibly in STEV 2011 but this may change

EPC will be expected to speak to Program Review (Counseling, Education, Nursing), General Education, and the FYE Pilot as the parent committee through which these are processed.

The subcommittees will also meet with members of the Visit Team.

We might want to think about how to structure the meeting beforehand since we only have 30 minutes. Perhaps we want to showcase what we are doing and how we can do it better.

SC: Our charge is also looking at resources (point #22). It is missing in the campus action plan (progress report).

CBB: There was not response at the time the progress report was written. The President is committed to the resources and it is in his hands.

We might want to add Resources as a 4<sup>th</sup> issue to discuss with the Visit Team as it has come up in the context of Program Reviews.

RL: Can we get an updated spreadsheet of the programs that have been reviewed and the schedule for review?

FYE—Can we get Sascha to come to give an FYE update?

CBB: There is positive feedback from students and faculty. It is a university-wide course and the Provost's Office is covering the support function.

KE and TS agree that it is a good idea to invite Sascha.

SC: It would be good to have Nathan there to clarify GE issues as well.

KE: It might be helpful to create a set of directed questions for them.

MH: Who can come?

Mary, Rick, Steve, Thaine, Sharon, and Lilian have all indicated they can attend the October 16 Visit Meeting.

### **Agenda Item 1.5.** YRO

CBB gave an update. It begins Summer 2007

A meeting was held with the Deans, the Provost, and Katherine Crabbe of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management to set the calendar.

- How to set it? The School of Education is on a different time line

- 2 4-week sessions with dates changed relative to the schedule that we have

- 1<sup>st</sup> session to start immediately after commencement (June 4<sup>th</sup>)

- 2<sup>nd</sup> session to start immediately following

- An 8-week session that spreads over both

- School of Education will begin a week later than the others because the teachers taking the courses have to finish teaching their school.

The schedule is still a draft.

MH: Why can't everyone do the same as the School of Education?

CBB: Students want to start asap to free up time later in the summer for jobs or travel.

TS: How will it be handled for the faculty? Will it be 2 semesters/year and you get the choice?

CBB: Summer teaching will be dealt with the same as it is now as the responsibility of the Deans and not Les Adler. It may affect Chair responsibilities during the summer.

It is more expensive this way than as Extended Ed so we will probably be offering fewer courses.

SB: Is there an incentive to get junior or adjunct faculty to teach because they are less expensive?

CBB: In her previous model there was a pot and it was allocated according to what had to be taught and who was qualified. It always resulted in a mix of faculty.

SC: 1. What is the chain of command for deciding the schedule?  
2. If Extended Ed moneys are paying for the bond and this takes away from Extended Ed, how will that happen?

CBB: Extend Ed is affected in a number of ways and they will have to do business differently. They should be a money-generating machine but have not been used that way in the past.

Extended Ed has time to build their business before their funds will be used to pay for the bonds.

MH: We have the calendar that we looked at last meeting because the University Standards has the responsibility for setting the calendar. The Exec Comm wants this to move forward.

CBB: The calendar comes out of SAEM.

MH: It should go from SAEM to University Standards to EPC (for evaluation in terms of educational content, for example 4 week sessions versus 8 week sessions) and then to the Senate.

A point to note is that when we evaluate the calendar we need to think about whether 4 weeks is too intense.

MH will talk to Michelle Jolie and have her connect with CBB about schedule and process.

LM: Who determines what courses we need to teach in the summer?

CBB: The department based on student needs.

SC: We should go back to our schools and raise these issues to get input (for example, 4 weeks v. 8 weeks).

TS: Can we have Les Adler come to EPC to give a report on Extended Ed's role? In past there has been pressure on what should be in Extended Ed.

SC: It is important to have Les Adler come because some Extended Ed programs go through EPC. It is important to sort out the issues. For example, winter intercession is still an academic program that goes through Extended Ed.

RL: When will summer registration start? When will we know which classes are offered? And will there be a push to offer more on-line classes?

CBB: The current schedule's date of April 2<sup>nd</sup> is probably about right. SSU has never done very much in on-line courses.

MH: Delivering courses in summer session to get what they need can be difficult. It may lead to running the 3<sup>rd</sup> session by paying overtime rather than hiring more faculty.

CBB distributed WASC material from the Accreditation Review Steering Committee (ARSC), co-chaired by the Provost and Andy Merrifield.

EPC should review Outcome #2—stopping above the diversity paragraph—and ask questions. The deadline is mid October for alterations. She will send it out in digital format.

We should also collect questions for Nathan and Sasha.

SC: Can we discuss this in an EPC meeting?

MH: But only have our meeting on the 12<sup>th</sup> before mid October.

SC: Could this and the 22 points be a good focus for our questions to Nathan and Sasha?

CBB: A question came up about Graduate Studies—12 versus 15 credit hours. WTU are not the metric for Grad Studies, SCH is.

## **Agenda Item 2.** GE Subcommittee activity

SC: With respect to assessment, FYE's incorporation of it is an excellent model for the rest of GE. We can also look at what WASC asks for with respect to assessment.

KE: Nathan will come to speak with EPC but the GE Subcommittee would like to incorporate assessment into its ongoing work on the Path. Waiting to assess all current GE courses before considering reform would stop reform. The GE Subcommittee would like to use Departmental Review and discussions with departments to help in assessment.

TS: We should focus on the charges of EPC and GE. EPC has the charge to set priorities whereas GE has the charge of overseeing assessment. Therefore, we should set assessment as a priority.

KE: Focusing on the charge has helped GE better understand the totality of what it should be doing rather than focusing only on one piece. Assessment of the current courses will not be easy because departments/faculty resist. They won't even put the way that their course serves the objectives in their syllabus?

LM: Aren't the GE objectives in the syllabus?

KE: It was recommended but not required so many faculty do not do it.

**Agenda Item 3.** 4 credit review: initial steps and timeline

MH: We were required to give an update but looking at pg 1, pt #2 of the 22 points document, it looks like the Academic Affairs Council is doing this. So, we need to find out what they are doing.

EPC school reps should check with their council of department chairs and dean on the 4 unit and YRO issues.

**Agenda Item 4.** On-line EPC materials review

SC: The Quick Guide posted on the web did not go through EPC

Background—Perry and Elaine McDonald looked at it last year for clarification.

SC: We need to check it and clarify it. School felt that the process had become complicated. Perhaps some things stopped in the APC and never made it to EPC? Not so much by-passed EPC as possibly bogged down in APC.

We need all of it outlined and in one place for consistency in timing and guidelines.

What is the role of APC in this process?

CBB: APC makes sure the proposal is complete and checks for protocol and legalism.

TS: Are we asking for a more detailed version of the Quick Guide?

SC: We should look at all curriculum-change documents and then improve all relevant documents.

CBB: A university normally has a binder with all the procedures in it.

SC agreed to take the lead on this

**Agenda Item 5.** Program Review Schedule

MH: The Program Review from EPC and any letter we write goes to the Provost, not to the Senate as we had assumed last meeting. Therefore, do we want the letter TS wrote concerning Counseling to be altered as a result of the different audience?

TS: The policy also says the report will be made available to the university community so the audience of our letter remains the same.

MH: I will put the letter up on a listserve so that we can all look at it.

## **Reports**

### **APC—SC:**

APC's general strategy is to divide into 4 groups.

Work Group 1: GE and lowering the SFR headed up by Art Warmoth

Work Group 2: Strategy planning and resource augmentation headed up by Robert Girling.

Work Group 3: Workload headed up by Susan Moulton

Work Group 4: Diversity headed up by Phil Huang (faculty and student diversity, in particular)

### **Graduate Studies—TS:**

At some point we'll want a report from them

Point 1: Some concern that SSU is admitting unclassified graduate students as part of the growth effort, but they have not been accepted into a departmental graduate program—free floating.

Apparently there is some sort of Management Training program under Larry Schlereth that is not necessarily associated with an academic program.

TS: The Graduate Subcommittee could produce a recommendation to pass up to us.

This question is being addressed in several venues so we will probably be seeing it.

Point 2: They discussed the impact of YRO on graduate programs

Point 3: The Graduate Showcase was very successful last year and they want to do it again this year.

SC: Any discussion about Extended Ed?

TS: Not so far.

### **Senate Budget Committee—SB:**

1. Up \$38 revenue and down 16 in FTS

2. Try to get Provost to commit to maintain an SFR and make budgetary decisions based on this

3. SBE—budget increases mentioned and a possible \$5 million endowment.

**Adjourned at 12:53.**