

EPC minutes Oct 1 2015

Present: Present: Nathan Rank (NR), Melinda Milligan (MM), Laura Watt (LW), Olivia Smith (OS), Richard Whitkus (RW), Kristen Daley (KD), Alvin Nguyen (AN), Jenn Lillig (JL), Tim Wandling (TW), Chiara Bacigalupa (CB), Kathryn Chang (KC) Louise Cerassi (LC)

Meeting called to order at 11:03

Agenda approved, minutes from 9/17/2015 approved with a minor grammatical correction from KD

Initial discussion of process for routing MCCCCF forms. TW suggested that there is lots of pressure on the EPC Chair to make decisions on MCCCCFs. He worries that the routing structure is not yet in place. LW says that she will not allow forms to go forward because of pressure from colleagues. MM says that GE courses (which the discussion wandered into from non-GE courses) should be considered separately from other courses. JL thought that this is the GE subcommittee's task. Further discussion about processes.

Reports

Chair Report (LW)- New job posting out for Faculty Center director. President search is underway. Campus-wide forum on Oct 8 for feedback to advisory committee to search committee. Dreamer center next to faculty hub approved. Ex Com decided that members of committees report to faculty governance about WASC process rather than forming a new ad-hoc committee. FSAC working on RTP policy revision. Senate Budget Subcommittee completed annual report, working group with Larry Schlereth as member just generated sustainable campus financial report; ultimately two may be compared. CFA also generating report on Sonoma State University finances. ACT working group is working on interdisciplinary degree structures within ITDS. GE Subcommittee approved area C3 course, and reviewing course proposal process. List of all degrees given on campus shared with committee, possible implications being discussed. TW responded that small majors should be protected. JL agreed. MM mentioned that these data may be used to decide on searches to fund.

Interim AVP, Academic Programs (RW)-

- Catalog revision is out. Many departments need to check degree requirements listing. Many programs have more general electives for students than they think they do because they report unit numbers incorrectly in the catalog. Take a good look at four year plans. The 'smart planner' is coming up and it will use these plans. Review your four year plans carefully! Course substitutions needed to allow experimental courses to count, rather than just changing ARR.
- Another ARR problem is that certificates are becoming integrated into the major without submitting a program revision to EPC. KD what if minor has certificate in it? RW if you are requiring a certificate for the minor this should be included. TW thinks we need to make sure that catalog changes happen when course approvals happen. He is teaching a course that has been approved but catalog copy has not been changed. RW if you want catalog copy changed submit to EPC. Can't change catalog at same time as course approvals. LW if you want changes for the year start early so it can get

into the catalog. MM also concerned about relationship between curriculum approval and catalog changes. Might be best to submit catalog copy with course proposals.

- Special concentrations must have a preapproved list of courses. Problems with some special concentrations at the moment, which are made up as students move through curriculum. TW understand that you are holding the line. But respect spirit of what has been approved in the past. Too many substitutions would be unfair to students. EPC should be seeing proposed changes to catalog with program or course revision documents. RW catalog changes are presently included in the program change documents. TW and MM mention that the other narrative text is what is concerned. JL points out that catalog changes do lag, e.g. Biology changes are not reflected in Chemistry catalog yet. Changes in ARR really help. Are you talking about situations like that? KD changes in Theater ARR have been made directly working with A&R. RW Katie in A&R does make lots of changes, and RW says that changes that affect catalog are the ones that are discussed here. Trying to prevent changes being made without faculty governance change. TW changes made in spring 2014 are still not in catalog. Making students do paperwork because of catalog lag seems unfair. KD just got catalog change documents and is responsible as Theater Chair to implement them. TW Chairs might not notice. MM RW's office is responsible for making sure that catalog reflects changes in programs. LW perhaps we can fix curriculum guide to address these issues. RW Biology change that was just approved was approved by Elaine Sundberg, so that is an example of this process at work. MM we are moving into a new world. Sometimes catalog copy was changed without consulting EPC in the past, we need to prevent that in the future.

Liaison to GE Subcommittee — T. Wandling

Voting member of Program Review Subcommittee — L. Krier

Liaison to/from Senate Budget Subcommittee — L. Watt

Liaison to University Standards - Vacant

Discussion Items

Visit from Chair of Program Review Subcommittee - D. Grant 12:10 TC

- LW this is one of several visits from EPC subcommittees to the committee.
- DG report from last year is now complete and LW will post on Moodle. Has been on committee for three years.
- DG past committee discussions have focused a lot on problems that are brought up in program reviews. So many reviews focus on lack of resources for department development and improvement. Some interesting workarounds being discussed in department program reviews. Some department program reviews lack discussion about assessment of student learning outcomes. Others are doing an excellent job of this. NR Which departments are doing well? DG especially those that experience regular re-accreditation, but others exist too. NR follow up can we make program reviews that do a good job of assessment available for other departments? TW concerned about resources needed to perform assessments. Is there a relationship between support for assessment and quality of assessments in program reviews? DG yes some learning outcomes can be aspirational, but it shouldn't all be aspirational.

- MM glad to hear that you have been talking with Rich about making reviews from past years available. How do departments get the information about what is desired? Sociology got information verbally, so there were good notes guiding the program review process, but some people might not have been clear about the direction. Are guidelines and standards available in written form or do they still base them on verbal information? DG great link on SSU site regarding program review process. MM necessary knowledge was communicated informally and wasn't in document on web page. Sociology's review was a totally different style than most, with permission from the administration, but some departments might not know that this flexibility is present. DG must be discussed. Every department seems to be doing it their own way. MM does committee have time to have those discussions and set up the web site?
- JL Chem department has lofty assessment goals and tries to do them, but what is needed is time. Hard to close the loop with limited support for release time for a faculty member. DG it does help inform curricular revision. JL NSF expects good assessment. DG different programs and departments. Sometimes person who knows most is on leave when the program review must be performed. Perhaps we need an office of assessment. RW has said similar things about assessment in the past. Put into review loud and clear when you think that resources were inadequate for assessment. Define needed resources clearly in review. Document what is lacking, so that WASC notices that. We can post versions of good program reviews. Posted policy shows template that departments should follow. Amount of focus on each part has lots of flexibility.
- NR program reviews have many parts and the external letters are important. Sometimes there are structural problems that must be addressed. The history of a department informs its program reviews. DG agrees that external reports are important. TW departments drive curricular revision by concerns about current structures and by developments in the discipline.
- JL template for external reviewers missing. This was very helpful for a recent review at Channel Islands. LW also found the lack of an external reviewer template frustrating and the program was undergoing major change in curriculum when she was reviewing it. Even own department's program review problematic with loss of 4 out of 7 faculty.
- MM would like provost feedback in the routing process for program review.
- RW question for group. How to move forward to help each program embed its assessment into normal day-to-day activities. May need some tweaks in terms of campus operations. Won't happen over night but if we find ways to do it we might move forward. What do people think about this?
- TW some people were excited about his at a recent conference. Student writing is hard to assess, and in one typical assessment it seemed to decline from junior to senior year. Is it worth the effort?
- JL likes Rich's idea. Can you consider faculty buy in. Example- in Chemistry department agreed to use ACS exams but if a faculty member refuses to comply how do we do it?

•

New Business: Biology BA, Zoology Concentration Revision - M. Pillai 11:30 TC

- MP introduced curriculum proposal to reinstate Zoology concentration. No change in unit requirements. One typo on course proposal form, under four additional upper division courses '14-16' should be changed to '13-16' because one eligible course moved from 4 to 3 units. The current proposal should have been included in last year's curriculum changes but didn't make it into the package.
- JL no letter from School Curriculum Committee is in this packet. CB doesn't signature count?
- JL second question. Assessment methods section doesn't seem like assessment strategies. Is this what EPC wants? It seems different than her understanding of what is expected. MP this is the same text as last year's proposal that was already approved by this body.
- RW Last year WASC was very concerned about assessment of student learning outcomes. We have aspirational rather than measurable outcomes. Has little to do with this proposal, but is an issue nonetheless.
- MM This committee could ask for changes in the text; it is a new committee. New question: text about choices that students have among courses is a bit unclear.
- TW Response to JL. Whole issue about school curriculum committee's rules is complex. EPC has responded in the past that letters not needed from school curriculum committees. On assessment, until university starts hiring people to do assessment faculty shouldn't have to do more assessment. WASC is right; we are aspirational.
- CB Form does say that it is program assessment. We have money for assessment in Education. Without this money we couldn't do it. JL It doesn't seem like an assessment. Not sure when we are supposed to do assessment. Second point, we need to know whether school curriculum committee decision was unanimous.
- NR what are we expecting Murali to do for the second reading? LW reluctant to ask department to make changes for this small part of a larger package that was approved last year. TW suggests we might waive the first reading for this proposal. CB agrees and states that she would second the motion.
- NR moves to waive first reading, CB seconds. JL asks for clarification of first readings and waiving them. JL wants the assessment strategies to be rewritten before approval, but doesn't want to see proposal again. TW doesn't think that the text that JL wants changed needs to be approved. It's just the rationale for the change that we will either approve or not approve.
- MSP for waiving first reading passed unanimously.
- MP SST curriculum committee approved unanimously.
- MM move approval of Biology proposal with condition that letter be sent to the Biology department regarding assessment language and technical components of proposal and that results of school curriculum committee be included in the package. CB seconds motion.
- Motion to approve Biology proposal passes unanimously

Meeting adjourned 12:50