

**Educational Policies Committee Meeting
Minutes
October 11, 2007**

Members present: Steve Bittner (SB), Erin Bower (EB), Sharon Cabaniss (SC), Mateo Clark (MC), Charles Elster (CE), Kirsten Ely (KE), Lillian Lee (LL), Lynne Morrow (LM), Thaine Stearns (TS), Carmen Works (CW), Carol Blackshire-Belay (CBB) and Student Representative appointee Katrina Svoboda (KS).

Meeting was called to order at 11:05 a.m. by Chair, TS.

Approval of Agenda: It was noted that the numbering of reports are incorrect, but otherwise approved

Approval of Minutes: Minutes not available

Business:

Business Item 1 - Program Review Process – 1st Reading

SC presented a draft of the Organization Process of Program Review. She did discuss this with Elaine Sundberg. Recommends a two-member review from among EPC who will present the committee with a “summary” to approve. Once approved the review team will draft letter of recommendation. The proposed guidelines for review are the same as those given to an external reviewer.

SB: Issues of expertise. Can someone in Humanities review a Sciences program?

CW: Curriculum committees would have already provided expert review?

TS: We need a procedure to move these along because we have several program reviews coming down the road.

MC: Resources seems to be a vital issue for all reviews. What is EPC's role when it comes to resources?

LM: EPC helps the programs better articulate their needs, including resources.

KE: EPC can do a better job by letting programs know what we're looking at up front, a template maybe.

TS: Send comments, feedback to Sharon, and we will put it on next agenda.

Business Item 2 – MA in Spanish (New Program) - 1st Reading

Jeffrey Reader, Chair, Modern Languages reported that all levels of review up to this point have been completed as directed by EPC after hearing the proposal at an earlier meeting.

JR: They received good feedback and incorporated them in the presentation today.

The program will be self-supported for the time being. They estimate there will be as many as 15 people in the program at any one time with an estimate of five new admits per year. It is anticipated that applicants will be from the local service area (Sonoma, Marin, Mendocino, etc.) and recent SSU grads.

Extended Education has already been brought into the picture.

A Coordinator/Advisor position is to be established receiving four hours of release time.

There are two unique features. 1) The majority of courses will be offered over three consecutive summers with a light load during the academic year. 2) The focus will not be on one specific area, encouraging students to take courses across the disciplines.

LM: For Education students?

JR: Electives have been opened up so that that is possible.

SC: Local community college connection?

JR: They would love to have that.

SC: Are there enough instructors to teach in the summer?

JR: It would require teaching one course every other year and then open up the rest to specialists and visiting faculty, possibly.

SC: Does the program have to go through CSU for approval?

Answer: Yes. JR is working with Elaine Sundberg to get that done.

TS: Comprehensive examination in addition to culminating project?

JR: Yes. There are three ways to exit a program. 1) Thesis, 2) Culminating project, and 3) Comprehensive exit exam. The program has opted for #3.

TS: For 2nd reading may we have more detail on culminating project?

JR: Yes.

MC: Is faculty aware of responsibility for exam?

JR: Yes. Faculty to volunteer time to evaluate the exam referring back to the reading list.

JR was invited back for a 2nd reading.

**Business Item 3 - Math Minor For Teachers – Ben Ford,
Department Chair of Math – 1st Reading**

BF: This program differs from the current math minor only in that it does not require calculus. Calc is not required for teachers.

TS: How are potential students being identified?

BF: These are students who are math majors with an interest in teaching.

KE moved to waive first reading. CW seconded. Approved unanimously. Moved to a 2nd reading. There was no further discussion. No additions.

KE moved to approve the proposal for the Math Minor for Teachers. CW seconded. Approved unanimously. Now goes forward to the Senate.

General Reports

Chair's Report - TS

FYE is coming up again. He will entertain any and all feedback regarding the program. EPC will be looking at it as a permanent program, and the 1st reading will be soon. How best to manage it because it dominated the agenda for several meetings when it came through as a pilot.

Heads up on the Singapore Program. A first reading is scheduled for the 11/8/07 meeting.

UNIV courses. Joyce Chong wants to bring EPC the recent info on the UNIV 236 course we had questions on. Joyce will be here next meeting. We might consider making changes to the new course proposal process. This ties in with curriculum guide discussion.

SC suggested having a couple of EPC members review those first. TS and LL volunteered to be that team.

SB: Is this FYE review for a proposal to extend pilot or make this a permanent course at its present size?

TS: The impression is that it is to make it a permanent course.

TS will forward the FYE assessment information to EPC members.

SC: Recalls there was a proposal to create a task force to look at expanding the program to all students.

EB: The GE subcommittee has been discussing it, but it hasn't been officially agendized yet.

TS will agendize the informal report from EB and the GE subcommittee.

CW: Has spoken to some of the instructors in FYE and they have little or no info on how FYE started and why.

Business – cont'd

Business Item 4 – LIBS Hutchins Program Review – Eric McGuckin – 2nd Reading

EM: Feel a bit like a guinea pig because their program was held up by WASC as a shining example. But for the review they got minimum compensation and it's time-consuming work. It took a lot out of them.

And what is this program review supposed to accomplish? What are the goals? Where do they go for information and guidance? How are the reviews used?

They did follow the review process procedures and learned from it. They have developed an action plan and already implemented most of them. They need more resources and staffing.

It takes \$65,000 per semester in allocation just to keep their heads above water. The number of Hutchins students have nearly doubled. The school now manage several programs. Yet they have had no additional faculty.

The program provides lots of contact time, not just between students and faculty, but among faculty as well. And they have made some internal changes to alleviate that, but met with resistance within. Hopefully, EPC will recommend that Hutchins examine the issue internally.

SB: Have they taken the \$65,000 per semester request to their dean?

EM: Hoping EPC will assist in bringing up the question.

TS: We can do that.

EM: As a faculty they can alleviate some workload, but some are reluctant to change. They meet too much, try to do too much, and bring it on upon themselves. He feels they need an outside entity to force the issue.

LM: Same issue in Music. Music is looking at resource issues too.

EM: If LIBS LD GE were given the same resources as FYE, then.... LIBS instructors teaching in FYE were astounded at the minimal amount of writing FYE students had to do in comparison to LIBS students.

SC: Resources – get the external reviewer to make that the top issue of their report. That may help more than an EPC recommendation.

EM: External reviewers can and do have their own agendas as was the case for this program review.

CW: FYE is the richest program (as a pilot), for now, so we will be looking at resource allocation. What about the GE Math and GE Science?

EM: All LIBS students must take at least one. The teacher tracks require all three. LIBS faculty are qualified to teach science education.

EM: Side note. They are very skeptical of CLA, they didn't even know how to answer the questions on CLA.

It was moved to extend the discussion for five minutes. SB seconded. Motion to extend unanimously approved.

KE moved to endorse the Hutchins Program Review with strong encouragement that Hutchins explore ways to decrease workload. Steve seconded. Approved unanimously.

EPC will draft a letter before it goes to Academic Affairs.

Special Report

Margie Purser, Chair of Grad Studies subcommittee

Handout – Charge to GSS

The subcommittee is composed of all Graduate Coordinators at SSU. A handout from 2006 was distributed - SSU Graduate Programs descriptive data. Issues include workload, and PBAC degrees.

SB: Data is dated, but what about the Manager Trainee Program?

MP: Those students were placed, not admitted. But they are moving through the program. It developed in a “perfect storm” - crisis management of low enrollment combined with people wanting training. They were brought in as Unclassified PBAC's, not

to a specific program (campus wide problem). Confounded situation.

Future of Unclassified PBAC in terms of enrollment management is not certain, but it's very much on GSS's radar.

SC: Sees a trend of more and more self-supported programs.
Issues of workload and resource allocation for program coordinators.

MP: Yes, self supported programs is a tidal wave, not just trend.
CSU wants growth and development of graduate programs at the lowest cost – self-support is the way to go.

TS: We should re-define resource allocation clause in our own charge. We can then be able to better define our charge to the GSS.

KE: Funding status of program coordinators is an issue. Not funded means no release time.

MP: It's hard for graduate programs to make a case for resource allocation especially if they are not "professional" programs.

SB: In History, only three carry the load for all grads. The university calculates SFR separately, UG and GRAD. But in other programs only a subset work with grads.

SC: Uniformity in release time?

MP: No, and does not reflect the realities.

KE: EPC may be looking at two separate charges to GSS.

MP: Looking at Manager Trainee Program and Unclassified grads raising visibility of graduate programs on campus, were included in WASC and the curricular process as graduate programs.
Significant initiatives currently in CSU. The GSS see one of their

charges as bridging the information gap between CSU and the campus.

MP: Don't wait too long to bring issues/charge to GSS. They are prepping for a big meeting

KE: When would be the best timing to give them the charge?

MP: They can send it through the EPC liaison to GSS.

Reports – cont'd

APC liaison – KE

Creating planning template to help departments and schools better plan for faculty needs and impact on SFR (schoolwide and department) including more data for consideration.

Can be used for program review planning too.

Survey on core priorities going out.

Concern regarding the process of changing names – colleges as opposed to schools. Can individual schools choose to be a college rather than a school?

APC suggested that any school wanting to be a college then they should bring up resource and planning issues.

TS: This issue was presented at the last Senate meeting of last year and got tabled. So now we are doing it all over again.

Meeting adjourned at 1:00.