

Minutes of 12/13/07 for EPC

TS: Any additions or objections to agenda?

None

TS: Agenda approved.

TS: Any questions or changes on minutes from 11/29/07?

None.

TS: Minutes approved.

TS: Can there be a volunteer to make a list of questions and answers during FYE and Singapore discussion on addition to the minutes to get a sense of concerns to bring to senate?

LL: I will.

TS: Suggestion to talk more about UNIV classes and EMT and so on.

SB: Likes the model because it faculty elects the deans, like it used to be. Maybe enact this across the university.

TS: the faculty doesn't take initiative so that's why administration stepped in.

SC: Does this affect the resources? We should put in draft that there are not subtractions from say upper division classes.

ES: The resources that would be taken out would be put back. Julie Greathouse is in charge of it and she will be reporting back to Academic Affairs.

TS: Collegiate learning assessment. We're going off the draft from 11/29/07.

SC: Point out that item #5 in the 11/29/07 minutes state that there was an amendment to the CLA but was postponed, never approved.

TS: Are there any changes?

None

SC: I will not approve because I think the mandate is wrong and, like Chico, we should state against it. Just because its mandated does not mean we should approve or make the best of it.

ES: The new resolved clause that was introduced last time is the note that SSU will only do it only if adequate funding; we should change it to fully due to the fact that we have to bribe people and take it out of SSU funds. As of now it's only partially funded.

TS: Can we get last postponed amendment approved?

SC: Motion to amend the amendment from adequately to fully.

EB: Seconded.

TS: Discussion.

None.

TS: Motion approved.

TS: The passage now reads.... W/ fully

TS: Approve the amended amendment?

All votes yes but SC.

TS: Any more amendments to oppose?

TS: We need a motion to recommend to the Senate.

Proxy for Ely: Move to recommend to the Senate

SB: Second it.

TS: Discussion?

None.

TS: All who approve recommending this to the senate say I
All approve but SC.

TS: First time certain is approval of the Geology changes.

Rheyna Laney: I'm here to answer the changes of the geology, the second reading, go over Resource Wars class syllabus for approval.

SC: In geology spatial techniques, you an added CS course, but no change in units?

RL: Also can choose between the course, between Programming and CS.

ES: The class number for a geo class should be 165, not 163, but that was just a typo that was pointed out last meeting.

SC: GOEG 315 was pointed out to have a change, does that change the total number of units?

RL: No.

Ely's proxy: Should the course description be more vague instead of focused on current events?

RL: I would counsel him to put in as such or make it broader.

SC: Suggestion to apply it to make Resource Wars an upper division GE?

TS: The point is a proposal to approve the GEOG 345.

SC: Motion to approve.

SB: Second.

MC: Signature seat?

RL: Has it.

TS: Make the appropriate changes before taken to senate?

RL: I will.

SC: We're missing the forms of signatures in our packet.

ES: The new form- the academic program review goes before signature sheets.

RL: I have it

TS: Any more discussion? Motion to approve say aye.

Unanimous yes

TS: Next subject with geology.

RL: I have a question with pre-requisites; the students have to finish the GE B section classes. The example of the planting classes that you take in sequence- they are only recommended. A geography class that requires a pre-requisite but it would be completed before anyway.

TS: I have a question of units missing.

RL: There are 4 units in that class.

SC: So the unit went up because all changed to upper division?

RL: Yes, the concentrations are all 20 and could end up with more depending on student path.

TS: Discussion or questions?

EB: Motion to approve.

TS: Motion to approve.

SB: Seconded.

TS: Discussion? Hearing none, all in favor in approving the proposed revision to geography and global studies.

Terry: Do you want to say no more than 10 units from a given department?

RL: We don't want them to take all classes from one section

TS: Any more? Should we call a vote? All in favor of approving?

Unanimous yes.

TS: All right this will go to the executive committee.

I encourage someone to attend Senate for the sake of giving a why to the changes and not just what are the changes. Then the Senate can require a reading.

RL: Last time I did that first because I didn't know any better.

TS: Next item onto the Singapore BA global studies program.

Les Adler and RL

TS: Second reading, Les provided a memo responding to issues raised in last reading, any responses? RL?

RL: Ask Les.

LA: The memo are responses as able as possible at this point, there will be more issues, there are some that will just have to be resolved later, and I'll just open to question?

TS: Lynn, you had a question.

LM: In reference to the Internet classes, will classes be monitored in Singapore? Like in China or can we establish secure online classes?

LA: I think so.

SC: Like in Yahoo, can we assure that the names won't be turned over, like in the Chinese government?

LA: Not any assurances, there has been no problem like China in Singapore.

EB: Question on the potential seriousness of the contracts.

LA: Yes, we talked about them.

SB: How do we proceed with the program if you have 2 departments who don't want to participate, history and political science, what will happen if it passes and what's your opinion on what will happen in the departments?

LA: If it passes then the history and political science classes will be somehow subbed in Singapore, other universities in Singapore to help us out. I don't think that the administration would force history and political science to provide classes if this is approved. We will continue to resolve the remaining issues as best we can.

SB: Is this also the feeling of the rest of the committee that this will not affect history and political science or force them to approve?

SB: The opinion of not being involved may be changed in the history department if it passes or that they can veto it if approved.

TS: Two questions in that: Does any one in the department have power to veto or opposed. Suggest it's a matter of precedence. Could be the same case with University 150? Second question: If we approve and Senate approve can the two departments be compelled to be involved in a program to which they were initially against?

SC: Make this clear: Is the issue that we have requirements for our students and these departments are the only two that teach them, so what do we do.

LA: Both the departments are test-out-able. If AP classes in high school or challenge tests are taken then there is a chance the students won't even have to take the classes.

RL: Political science's position has more to do with the labor issue. That goes along with the most departments.

SB: The collective bargaining agreement says that the Singapore campus is exempt but it might be a problem with contract.

LL: I'm worried that if it becomes a bone of commotion especially since its already that way. Does the proposal bind people to participate? It's too big an issue to ignore and we should be sensitive.

LA: As in the memo there's a major precedent for this in the program. Faculty would be comparable to the applicable CSU contract. The CFA and the CFU would look into this. This was not created to divide faculty, Senate will weigh in on all these issues.

TS: The primary concern for this committee is the curriculum factors, how it affects the departments and the institution. The second part is program review, what can we make sure happen in the program review sense, its in a 3 yr program review. The question is can it go forward as a pilot? No, pilots are for classes not programs. But we can say that it can. The third point is the question of resources and that's a big part of concerns. I think it would, we need to come to some sort of resolution in the next 15 min or postpone it.

SB: If it's the will of the committee to pass this on to the Senate I ask you to address the conflict of political science and history to the motion.

TS: Could you help us out with that?

SB: Is it the view of the committee that history and political science are bound by the program or are they not?

EB: I don't feel that you'd be bound, do you think its something where agreements could be reached or do you feel you don't want to be bound?

SB: There's no guarantee that we won't compromise but the concern is that if it passes in the Senate it may be out of your hands.

LM: If this is a resource issue?

SB: No it's a fact of face time with professor and the fact that we're selling our degree.

Terry: You could give the responsibility to other departments like the school of Extended Education, and not pressure the history to offer classes.

SC: This program should be re-proposed to political science and history and an agreement should be reached before we make the vote and I would vote against it with two department. Against it.

TS: So the issue is our approval without history participation. The mechanism in place is we are approving a program that cannot offer a SSU degree.

LA: There are two different issues from each history and political science. Political science is not opposed history is opposed. My expectation is that we would talk forever and an agreement might not be reached. Steve's proposal is the issue that will come up after it's approved at EPC and Senate. A sub mechanism can be found.

TS: We have 7 minutes and FYE coming in at 12:25pm, we need a proposal.

Terry: I think that Sharon's question is relevant, but I approve the program as presented to the Senate.

TS: We have a motion to approve the program as presented to the Senate

EB: Second

SC: Putting aside there are objections to the program; there could be a list or presentation of all departments. Who would object?

SB: History's list is in a letter in the packet.

LM: If we don't approve this does that mean it won't get discussed in the Senate.

EB: Can the packet we send along include the concerns to the Senate?

TS: We can still amend the document before we send it.

MC: If we send this to the Senate there will be a chance for department who are not even included in this to speak.

SC: I would like to make an amendment that no department is bound by the approval to act the department function.

MC: Second.

TS: Approval?

SB: Terry's idea was that if history doesn't join, then Extended Education can offer classes.

SC: So history doesn't have to offer any courses in program.

TS: All who approve say aye?

Unanimous yes

EB: The things on the table to be worked out that are not in the packet will be presented.

TS: Motion is that issues surrounding the database licensing cost will be discussed.

Terry: Seconded.

Unanimous yes.

SC: I'd like to make an amendment that if the program has significant problems in the program review in three years, EPC can terminate the program.

MC: Do you think (Les) that the possibility of being terminated would affect the investors?

LA: I don't think so.

ES: WASC requires that students have a way to graduate even if program is terminated.

TS: Do you mean a program review that happens after the end of three years?

At the end of three years the program will be reviewed and if there are problems that EPC can tell it will be terminated

TS: Motion to amend the motion to amend.

Terry: Significant problems that cannot be resolved to EPC satisfaction

Approved.

TS: At the end of three years there'll be a program review and EPC can terminate it.

Unanimous yes.

TS: Back to approve the motion to send to Senate.

Vote?

All in favor for motion to approve the Singapore program as amended?

SB and SC say no

SB: Can we have a hand count?

TS: Five in favor, two opposed, one abstains- LL.

TS: Let's introduce ourselves.

Those from FYE: Karen Brodski, Nathan Rank, John Cornfield, Tom Shaw, and Anne Greenblat.

TS: This is a course proposal for the first reading of a course call University 150. The syllabus is included for fall and spring. The full assessment of the FYE program was emailed. There are some documents not in the packet that are provided by John today or told to us, which include financial statement and approval. There are no EPC forms attached that would be required. Who is coordinating the course and who signed off on its

creation? This relates to the concern that there needs to be a couple required signatures. Did philosophy approve its critical thinking course?

Did all departments that require A1 courses sign off? Currently A1 classes are all second level courses but did not see how 150 is substituting for second level course.

John: Rank is head of GE committee, Shaw is not a teacher but spearheading working with Rose Bruce, Anne has been involved in FYE for years, and Karen is from the library. I want to remind you that in the report and recommendation one of the key points is that FYE a viable course for freshman. Yes, but there is definitely room to ramp it up. What I'm asking you for today is approval to continue the course for 170 students.

Philosophy says it may ease burden with 170 students out; but if there's an increase then some courses will be dropped. The GE subcommittee and English department suggest that there's a chance from A2 and A3 course to A1 and A3. As they viewed the course they felt they were more closely aligned to A1. This would give students a more intensive experience than in regular A1 classes. Another good thing of switching to A1 they can take students who can't with English 99 and accommodate people who passed AP English who wouldn't take it. A letter of the impact of the FYE program on the philosophy department and impact of FYE on global studies 200 if the FYE shifts. GE A1 and the English letter.

SC: I want to make sure rational was correct

JK: Yes.

JK: How much more does it cost to have the FYE compared to taking PHIL 101 and ENGL101? Paper is this years budget. Total is 24,2135. Funding for FYE is coming out of growth funding which is coming out of the Chancellor's office of the average student. Find the 143 dollars per student per unit. So it's 15 dollars more per student to go through FYE than regular GE.

SC: Salary's based on 8 WTU and the FYE has 9, so what affect does this have on faculty workload?

JK: The faculty is working with the 8 units the reality is the SSP's are working more but there is this differential to help pay for that. We are actually committing 6 hours per week. Workload is an issue but all involved are willing to include themselves.

TS: We are in the first reading.

JK: I don't think 23,5000 is that much for the FYE program.

Terry: The coordinator gets 4 WTU's per semester? So in here we said for the year and the coordinator is only there for the semester.

TS: Any questions for the rest of them?

LL: Looking at the students should be able to according to the FYE, if you are thinking about presenting this with the A1 and A2 cause it might be confusing with mixing it up with the GE's.

SC: On the budget: there are only 4 lectures for the whole year?

JK: The lecturers give their time that are here and only a few of campus people with 500 dollars for traveling expenses. There are lecturers coming that students will be required to see. At the most 5 traveling lecturers.

SB: Is this the case or has it been proposed that the professionals are providing the stipends?

ES: \$150,000 distributed to the school, an amount went to the teaching school, an amount went to professional development sub committee, and a small amount went to a grant and then \$10,000 to the GE program- not being spent on FYE.

TS: I want to know that if there are questions could you forward them to me or John Cornfield and I. Second is how much time should we set out for a second reading?

SB: As much as possible, perhaps to delay program reviews.

TS: 40 minutes went to Singapore, 40 minutes to this, so an hour set aside for the second reading.

JK: I would have loved to bring in FYE faculty so ask those involved in it to answer question.

TS: With that we're adjourned.