

EPC Minutes  
March 10, 2011  
11:04 meeting began

### **Present**

Chair Elaine Newman, Thaine Stearns, Sharon Cabaniss, Laura Watt, Armand Gilinsky, Alex Boyar, Mary Dingle, Lynne Morrow, Karen Brodsky (proxy for Joe Marquez, library), Amy Kittelstrom.

### **Minutes from 2/24/11**

Approved

### **Reports**

1. EPC Chair (EN) met with Pillai on the possibility of creating a Program Review (PR) subcommittee, possibly not going to be done by end of year. EN had intended to have another report on SB 1440 but the Executive Committee told her to distribute a one-page handout Elaine Sundberg made, summarizing SB 1440. Discussion revealed that in the APC meeting this morning it came up that the chancellor has put out a new executive order regarding what can be offered through extended ed., specifying that remedial courses can be offered online. AB commented that the conversation is happening in the school of Arts and Humanities as well. TS commented that in the deans' meeting the topic came up, not as an executive order, but in conversation. The English department does not do remedial work but has a stretch program. Awareness of the budgetary situation for the fall as untenable. There is not even enough money to offer composition and critical thinking for the projected 1800 new freshmen. This plan is only appealing from a budgetary perspective to give jobs (w/o benefits) to lecturers. SC commented on giving lecturers opportunity, because in the math department summer courses and such are taught by regular tenure-track faculty because they're so low paid that they need the money. SC said that SB 1440 came up at the union meeting, which also mentioned the university looking into the idea of stopping funding a program, especially a graduate program, and telling them they can do it if they go to self-support rather than state support. This is being discussed system-wide. Monday town-hall meeting on the budget, so people should go and ask questions; the Graduate Sub-Committee invited the Provost to come to a meeting and we should do the same thing to clarify his thinking on extended ed and other issues.

EN has a question for the committee about our role as a curriculum committee on these major change on how curriculum is offered, and who approves this? Does faculty have a say in how this goes forward?

LM says it's important for us as a committee to insist on faculty control. On a search committee for her department, she has encountered candidates from institutions with this online offering in place and they're not happy.

KB asked about existing documentation on this; TS answered yes there is something from 1996, but it doesn't seem to be referred to in conversation. LN has a copy of it, a memo to Rick Luttmann, then chair of EPC, very informal, about non-credit pre-college classes that may include remedial. TS then offered a document that seemed to back up EPC's jurisdiction over such an issue, but it's an open question whether it has any force.

AB not comfortable with figuring out the document, but what he thinks is happening is a straight-up shock doctrine and they're trying to pass through really bad budgetary policies in a time of crisis, so we should play political hardball: having Academic Senate and AS to send forth a co-proposal. EN warmly endorsed this idea.

MD reminded the group that "the world is moving toward online courses" and she teaches some that go well and we shouldn't just say no, but actually think about it as "coming" so that we can be on the forefront about thinking through the issues as a faculty. EN warmly acknowledged the importance of this reframing of the issue.

EN again raised the question of who is going to be chair

2. TS on SAC policy on attendance. EN read the changes they made: a sentence on valid reasons for missing class; one on students' responsibility; a third paragraph on instructors' responsibility in specifying policy on course outline and "reasonably" providing means of making up absence.

TS opposes its becoming a blue-paper policy on the grounds of the internally conflicting language. LM reads it as the important word is "request" rather than "provide," but TS says then it doesn't rise to the level of blue-paper policy. EN will argue against making it blue-paper. SC looked at the course outline policy, which does not specify that instructors are required to delineate the impact of absences on students' grades. EN: FSAC approved it; EPC the only committee to raise questions. MD asks about the evidence that they have approved absences.

### **Business Items**

1. Guest Robert McNamara for our second reading of the reorganization of the Latin American Studies reorganization. We had asked for it to be reviewed by the curriculum committee for Arts and Humanities, which approved it. AG moved to approve; LW seconded. Unanimous approval.
2. EN: what the Executive Committee insisted we talked about: the Academic Calendar. Background: chancellor pushing Arminana on the lateness of our spring start date, with a proposal to start and end two weeks earlier. No winter intersession? No longer following academic calendar guidelines. We don't get to approve the new dates, but we do get to approve the guidelines. TS: noted differences that don't conflict with the guidelines. LM: asked about spring break. EN: now disassociated from Easter, not related to what local schools are doing, but to Cesar Chavez. LW: spring break this year screws over transfer students because it's the week before Reg 1. KB: observes that students can't work as much during winter break, just so they can work more in the summer. TS: anticipates that in the Senate the change will clash with the policy, and questions will be raised regarding taking away more days off from faculty. He proposes to remove clause 7 regarding spring break. AB: AS had already proposed such a change, but they are concerned about how this will impact the students who rely on winter intersession to take a prereq for a spring course. SC: clause 6 seems to be violated because intersession will move to May, but we should check on the concrete impact on faculty who, like LM, already has contracts, as well as on students. MD: her students travel to get to campus and there's more stormy weather in January. KX: emphasized importance of Cesar Chavez.

3. Deborah Roberts (DR) from nursing on ways to obtain an RN license. SSU offered students who had a license from an Associate program a way to earn a BA; in the 1990s they started offering a pre-licensure program as well. Now so competitive; in 4 years they haven't accepted anyone with less than a 3.7. They want a conceivable program where students with a BA could take all their prereq's and then have 2 years in the nursing program at full time status, becoming the traditional track. Post-licensure students could enter the last year of the program with traditional students, taking some of the same courses as well as transitional courses (312 and 313). SC: completing all their GE in the first two years includes upper-division? DR: no, they take the two others in their last year. AG: are some courses going to be cut because of faculty retiring or what? DR: no courses are going to be cut, but stranded because pathophysiology and pharmacology and so on should be learned in the context of their other work, rather than standing alone. Folded in in a more practical sense; they've also connected the labs to the lectures because students fail the lab, not the lecture, and when they cycled around to retake the lab a year later, they audited the lecture. Total units the same. SC: sees one upper-division GE but can't see the other one. TS: found it in the sophomore year. TS: on GE, students who are in one of these programs are fairly constrained in their path through, so the program needs to take into account the A&H reconfiguration. A2 and A3 in the freshman year fall semester will both be 4 units; spring semester GE A1 is dropping out of the GE pattern altogether; C1 will move to 4, making the total units about the same. But sophomore year C2 and C3 go to 4. In the Social Sciences the D category has a lot of 4-unit classes. There is no C4 anymore. Committee recommended DR work on the numbers and come back for a second reading.
4. Wanda Boda and John Kornfeld on Freshman Transition courses. Returning as requested with their progress on what they're hoping to implement in the fall. Univ 102 being rethought, which is why they didn't want to do a program review. Transition courses are a high-impact practice, and so are blocked courses like Fig, Mosaic, and EOP: linked classes whose students stay together all year. For their pilot, JK has met with TS, WB, and others. The name is undecided, but it will be a one-unit UNIV 102 with a 3-unit ENGL 100A. SC: asked for clarification on what these courses are doing. JK: freshmen at SSU either place out of remedial English and Math or have to take it; this is the "stretch program" that gets those students to the same place that ENGL 101 takes the non-remedial students. WB: often same faculty teaching UNIV 102 and ENGL 100A. JK: even with the budgetary uncertainty, the English department needs to plan for this now. Curriculum in progress and projected numbers (12 sections) a "rough guess." MD: what would be changed? WB: whittling down course content to focus on the most essential things. SC: did you consider another unit of UNIV 102 combined with ENGL 100B; how many sections of 100A are offered to accommodate students not in this pattern? TS: 26 sections this year. WB: they have not been funded for the spring and it brings up entitlements for different faculty, who have been planning on teaching in the fall. It's a resource issue. LM: running into a problem with students in the program when sections need to be switched around, is there a solution for that? TS: it's a logistical improbability to allow students to move from section to section. JK: the advising issue is a summer issue looking ahead to the spring, given the number and range of sections students should be able to find one. WB: it's been only one or two students

in the past, but usually it can get fixed. AB: question about 150 for Fall 2011 on figuring the unit load. JK: FYE is going to be both A3 and C3, both of which have one unit of oral communication built in. UNIV 150 is going to the one-unit model. TS: suggested changing it to a one to three variable. EN: likes the idea of focusing on the learning communities, and asked a question about unit distribution. JK: about 15 traditional ones, varying by category. AG: what happens to the other 631 students? WB: people in science and technology don't get into a transition course. AG: any data linking those who don't graduate with those who don't take the freshman year courses? JK and WB: they would like that data. MD: could it be thought about attaching to a science and math class, to develop that community for them. JK: there is a pre-health FIG, but the school of S&T has put together an NSF for a Freshman Exp combining C3 with required area B GE. WB: maybe Math 45. When you're doing orientation you can tell when someone needs more help. JK: Cindy Morazumi, the director of residential life, knows the number, but he thinks 20-30 students who are science majors are in UNIV 150. SC: Susan Herring from the Math department has been running a FIG that has been very successful. EN: very thorough, very interesting; thank you for taking the time to organize all this information; the pilot program looks good. They'll need an MCCCCF form down the road.

5. Discontinuance Policy, second reading: Provost delegated JK to give feedback for him; John Wingard also reviewed it and has one suggestion. TS: added language about credential programs, and small changes. AG: should the re mean regarding? TS: yes, thanks. AB: one concern on discontinuance is with the potential move for switching courses to self-support there is the feeling that if you allow the funding source of a program to be switched to self-support that is a way to discontinue it, so does this address that problem? TS: included language about de facto discontinuance, specifying that if a funding change occurs, EPC can be consulted. AB: consultative power for EPC doesn't sound substantial enough. EN: thinks that if an administrative officer is starving a program of resources, then someone else in that program can come forward, so this document is trying to give faculty the right to come forward for a hearing with EPC. TS concurs. EN: is the move to self-support included here; the onus is on the department to come forward. TS: other CSU discontinuance policies specify program reorganization as included in discontinuance.

AB moved to include "changes in funding structure" in that paragraph. LW seconded. JK: if you had a graduate program now switched to self-support, and if you discontinued it it would have to go all the way back through university governance to get it approved. Lot of work for faculty. TS: an example of a grad program in Extended Ed informed by dean that unless enrollment met a certain level funding would not be provided to hold the courses for that program, suspending it for a year. There was no mechanism for the department to do anything. There is no program suspension or hiatus policy, so on some level it falls under this as de facto discontinuation. If it starts withering, even in a for-profit unit, it will be hard to get it going again. EN: the proposal is to draw attention to the fact. JK: if a faculty member did this, would it be to say to the administrators either drive it or park it. The body should consider the potential for an administrator to respond otherwise than how the faculty desires, so that rather than funding it they may actually follow through with discontinuance. EN: emphasizes that the policy gives faculty the ability to choose. AB: an option for people to take rather than a mandate. SC: in favor of the amendment, from the

perspective of a state-funded program told to switch to self-funding. A place to fall back to would be faculty governance. AG: interprets the policy as bringing the EPC into the loop when a department decides to discontinue a program. TS: can he change where the proposed added clause go into the sentence to make it parallel: "Because of proposed changes in funding structure or..." Vote unanimous approval.

Second reading extended to our next meeting.

Meeting adjourned.

Minutes prepared by Amy Kittelstrom.