

Educational Policies Committee
Minutes
9/04/08

Members Present: C. Works, B. Bryant, S. Cabaniss (SC), M. Clark, S. Cunningham (SCu) K. Ely, K. Hatch, T. Kelley, L. Morrow, J. Wingard.

Liaisons Present: M. Barnard, R. Coleman-Senghor, S. Moulton, E. Sundberg, Tim Wandling

1. The meeting was called to order.
2. The agenda was approved.
3. The minutes were approved without changes.
4. Laurel Holstrom provided a powerpoint tutorial in Robert's Rules.

REPORTS

1. CW reported on the charge of EPC for new members and noted current work of subcommittees, especially the GE subcommittee's response to the WASC report. CW noted that the Executive Committee has asked EPC to address any curricular aspects of the President's response letter to the vote of no confidence.
2. Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs Report: M. Barnard provided a verbal report on developments related to University courses, asking EPC if this content should be put into a written report for the Senate. She noted the courses under discussion, UNI 102, UNI 103, UNI 150 (FYE) and UNI 238-39, were all unit-bearing courses. She reported that over the summer, a collective agreement reached with Unit 4 personnel specified that they must be paid for instruction as Unit 3 overload. MB noted that this requirement created budgetary and staffing issues addressed for F08 semester by filling UNI 102 from a lecturer pool and UNI 150 through FT and PT faculty. MB reported that in Spring 09, several 239s will be launching taught by SSPs. MB noted that many issues are raised related to finding funds, staffing the courses, or changing the courses' unit-bearing status. MB clarified that she currently serves as a kind of dean for the program. RC noted the need for faculty oversight and expressed concern about increasing unit load without review. MB noted the proposal for a new undergraduate Dean for the five UNI courses that do not have a designated department chair. MB noted that she wanted to make sure EPC was involved in forthcoming questions related to these courses. MB proposed that the program review of UNI 102 be postponed because of these structural questions. LM requested MB prepare a document clarifying the 4-5 points under discussion. CW noted that 102 have a lot of data and are ready for program review. SC noted a previous proposal in progress for a dean of undergraduate studies and inquired about its status. RC suggested that the proposal should come to both committees (APC & EPC?) and be vetted or not vetted. KE suggested that having the information from the 102 program review would be useful for any incoming undergraduate dean and proposed the composition of a 1-2 page document that describes the development of this issue and what needs to be decided before courses are planned for the spring. MB noted that she

means this to be a point of information for EPC and that EPC should decide whether to bring it up in the senate. RC noted the importance of considering the previous processes that led to these courses becoming unit-bearing and noted that the senate had rejected a proposal concerning 102 in the past. MB noted that it was not within the expectations of her position to provide a historical report and that she is acting now to adapt to collective bargaining results. KE suggested that the issue be separated into two matters: 1) the history of the development of these courses, to be considered later on and 2) a briefer document should be prepared to address immediate planning concerns. SM suggested EPC discuss the structure of the courses and the merit of giving them units and noted that a dean of undergraduate studies was not the only way to organize the courses. SC noted that logistics for a 102 program review may make it difficult and inquired whether 103 was funded by a federal grant. MB responded that 103s are being paid by grants but that SSPs had to be hired as lecturers. KE suggested that this should be brought up at the next EPC meeting. CW concluded that MB will write a clarifying report and it will go on the next agenda.

2. Vice Provost for Academic Programs Report: E. Sundberg provided a report on issues raised by the WASC report, noting that EPC members should consult the WASC materials online. ES highlighted two primary issues for EPC members: 1) WASC's advice that SSU "close the loop" on learning outcomes and assessment and 2) WASC's perception of lack of progress on GE reform. Concerning "closing the loop," ES suggested that EPC could provide feedback on this matter. Concerning GE reform, ES noted that the GE committee is engaged in defining learning objectives for areas B, D, E and is opening discussion of A and C this fall. The GE committee is planning a program review this year with an external review in the Spring. ES also noted that the President's statement at convocation concerning a move to 4-unit GE courses would have bearing on GE developments. The provost will be coming to the next GE subcommittee meeting to clarify issues. ES provided revised academic calendars based on previous EPC work and noted that scheduling constraints necessitated some deviations from EPC guidelines, which are noted on the calendar documents. Addressing the program review issue, LM noted the importance of giving departments reasons for program review. LM also noted concern about departments for which 4-unit courses will not work. SC proposed thinking up guidelines for follow-up to program review. SM recommended that EPC identify cross-departmental program-review issues (e.g. information technology) and suggested the each department have a summary of or link to its program review posted online.

BUSINESS ITEMS

1. Rose Bruce, CLA: R. Bruce was present and asked EPC's endorsement for "embedding" the CLA into courses, noting that this is done on other CSU campuses and that students would receive an informed consent form. RB proposed that embedding the CLA would solve self-selection and other procedural problems with the survey. KE expressed concerns about whether self-selection could in fact be solved by embedding CLA into courses. LM asked how much time an "embedded" CLA would require of a course and noted that the phrasing suggested significant involvement. Questions were raised concerning which first-year courses would be appropriate for CLA embedding:

ENG 101 and PHI 101 were proposed. T. Wandling, present for this discussion, urged EPC not to take this step and noted deep concerns with the approach of “value added” education. KE voiced concerns over the possible penalties for not going along with CLA, proposing that as an alternative SSU would need to come up with its own assessments and statistics. SM suggested bringing the issue back to state-wide bodies. ES noted that the CLA is one part of the “college portrait” which contains many other facets. ES said that we were mandated to participate and that EPC’s endorsement would produce only invitations to faculty to participate. JW inquired about what role EPC would play and expressed concerns about the methodology of sampling. TW said that CLA was being implemented more fully than had originally been proposed. TK asked whether students were aware of purpose (RB: yes) and noted that students motivated by cash reward may not be taking the test seriously. SC noted the possibility of adjunct faculty who taught the to-be-embedded courses (ENG & PHI 101) feeling pressured. CW observed two issues at play: 1) the question of whether to buy in to the CLA program and 2) the protocol for administering the CLA. CW scheduled a second reading and requested more information on CLA.

ASSIGNMENTS

1. Liaison Assignments: Liaison assignment featured a discussion over the rules concerning liaisons and their purpose. At issue was the relation of subcommittees of EPC to EPC proper and how that would reflect on restrictions on liaisons. It was proposed that TK serve as a liaison with APC, but the question of multiple representation was brought up. KE noted that in the past EPC had chosen not to have student representatives liaise. JW will serve to communicate with the Graduate Studies subcommittee until a liaison volunteers. KE will liaise with University Standards. CW will liaise with GE subcommittee. The liaisonship for the Academic Senate Budget Committee remains open.

2. Minute Assignments: Minutes were assigned.

3. Program Review assignments: For the benefit of new members, CW noted the streamlined program review system: teams of 2 members not within the school of the reviewed department will work on program reviews. Reviewing teams were appointed for AMCS and CALS.

BUSINESS ITEMS

2. Discontinuation of Art Therapy: CW provided background on the previous work on the discontinuation of the Art Therapy concentration, noting that this item did not make it to the Senate Executive committee last year. CW opened the meeting for questions or concerns about her bringing the issue before the senate later that day. ES and JW discuss the consequences of discontinuing programs. It is noted that discontinuation of a concentration has less extensive concentrations than other kinds of discontinuations.

The meeting was adjourned.

Minutes submitted by B. Bryant.