

Educational Policies Committee
Minutes for 14 September 2006

Members present: Mary Halavais (chair), Steve Bittner (recorder), Sharon Cabaniss, Lynne Morrow, Thaine Stearns, Carol Blackshire-Belay, Carmen Works, Kirsten Ely, Lillian Lee, Jared Russell, and Rick Robison.

Quick Guide to Sonoma State Curriculum Changes added to agenda. **Agenda approved.**

Correction to minutes from 31 August 2006: Kirsten Ely noted as present, and referred to as KE throughout. **Minutes approved.**

Business

1. Program review, Counseling Department. Maureen Buckley and Meri Storino told the committee about the Counseling Department's M.A. program in community and school counseling, and the Department's recent accreditation by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). CACREP accredited the Department for two years (through 31 October 2008), noting that it had met or surpassed 96 of the 100 criteria it considers. However, CACREP did not offer a full seven-year accreditation, citing enrollment in the Department's group supervision courses that exceeds ten students, and an overall SFR that exceeds 10:1.

Motion by TS to waive the first reading. **Seconded** by SC. **Motion approved.**

Committee members asked how EPC might facilitate program review in departments like Counseling, where outside evaluators cited high SFRs. TS suggested that EPC attach a letter to its approval of the Counseling Department's program review voicing support for the Department's efforts to get a full seven-year accreditation, and recognizing that such accreditation requires institutional support for faculty appointments. CB indicated that President Arminana and Provost Ochoa were willing to provide the necessary support. TS asked why the Counseling Department came to EPC before going through the Graduate Studies Subcommittee. Storino and Buckley indicated that they arranged with Perry Marker, chair of EPC in 2005-06, to circumvent the Graduate Studies Subcommittee because of a delayed response from CACREP.

Motion by TS to approve the Counseling Department's program review and append a letter, which TS will pen and circulate among committee members by email, that supports the Department's request for greater institutional support. **Seconded** by SB. **Motion approved unanimously.**

2. Meeting on October 16 with the Campus Peer Review Team. CB reminded the committee that the Campus Peer Review Team will be visiting campus in October to gauge SSU's progress toward the goal of graduating students in four years. She encouraged committee members to review the "Facilitating Graduation Initiative Report" and the "Facilitating Graduation Progress Report" on the Academic Affairs website. She also asked that committee members attend a meeting with two persons from the Campus Peer Review Team on October 16.

Action: the committee decided to return to this issue at a later date.

3. Minutes. MH assigned EPC members to take minutes during fall semester.

4. Meeting time. EPC members agreed to meet from 10:45 to 12:45 for the remainder of the semester. EPC will revisit the scheduling issue at the beginning of spring semester 2007.

5. Summer 2007 calendar. MH circulated the calendar proposed by the University Standards Subcommittee for summer 2007. Several committee members expressed confusion about the rationale for calendar changes, and asked why the University Standards Subcommittee had been charged with this issue. CW asked why there were two summer semesters instead of one, and what impact the new calendar would have on faculty workload. LL asked whether the University Standards Subcommittee had consulted the registrar.

Action: EPC tabled work on the summer calendar until Michelle Jolly, chair of the University Standards Subcommittee, can respond to members' concerns.

6. Report by KE on the GE subcommittee. KE indicated that the GE Subcommittee requested clarification about what sort of GE assessment EPC wants. She also said that the GE Subcommittee heard a proposal by Art Warmoth to convene a special taskforce on GE reform. The GE Subcommittee does not want GE assessment to stall GE reform, and will thus utilize components from existing program review to expedite assessment. TS said he was reluctant to authorize a task force to reform GE when a suitable body already exists. LM said that EPC members want to know where the GE Subcommittee is on assessment. MH said the purpose of the motion tabled at the previous meeting was to charge the GE Subcommittee with devising a plan for GE assessment by the end of fall semester.

Meeting adjourned.