

Educational Policies Committee  
Minutes  
10/28/10

Members Present: E. Newman, T. Stearns, T. Lease (for A. Gilinsky), M. Dingle, S. Cabaniss, J. Marquez, L. Lee, A. Boyar, A. Kittelstrom, L. Morrow, and L. Watt (minutes)

Liasons present: A. Warmoth

Chair's Report:

Senate:

- GE Learning Objectives for Areas A&C postponed until today, for a chance to consult with the Philosophy Dept – E. Newman will propose no amendments again, trying to protect integrity of the faculty groups' work on objectives. Discussion of this issue to give EN guidance on how much to argue against proposed amendments if the proposal does not pass.
- 3-unit policy review postponed until December, as the GE Subcommittee was asked to come up with a metric to determine whether there are enough 3-unit seats available – perhaps impossible to satisfy everyone? Concern re: “unit creep” – S. Cabaniss notes that all chairs from Science & Technology have responded to her email query about this, saying that GE unit creep would be negative – perhaps those in other schools want to do something similar? She will email out her synopsis.
- Changes to Finance and Financial Mgmt Majors on consent calendar for today
- When we had University 102 representatives to visit EPC , we asked them to come back – since then have met with EN & she's asked them to come to 11/8 meeting, and they've convened a faculty working group to look at freshmen-transition classes – aim to create a more coherent whole?
- Signed all MCCCCF for CALS Dept. for A&C reform

Changes to Agenda: T. Stearns added discussion item from English re: EPC charge regarding resource priorities and program discontinuance (becomes Agenda Item #3)

Agenda approved.

Minutes from 10/14/10, E. Newman added herself to the chart of task force volunteers – minutes approved.

Reports:

Graduate Studies:

- Problem with review of transcripts for graduate admissions – will be resolved.
- Provost concerned with looking at Extended Ed. – vast array of different contracts for similar programs, and issue of support for graduate coordinators – wants more uniformity.
- Review of certification programs by related departments – chairs consulted vs. whole dept., also ambiguity of course numbering systems and what kind of credit they might count for

- Program Review – for departments with both undergrad and graduate programs, be sure both are addressed in MOU
- Graduate Showcase is ON for next spring – it's funded and will take place

#### GE Subcommittee:

- Have moved through many courses in A&C, based on learning outcomes before the Senate now.

#### University Standards:

- Received a few petitions last meeting, specifically about course repeat policy and a new form for that (the current policy and PeopleSoft process are misaligned)

#### APC:

- Provosts' task force planning & implementation framework goes to Senate today for discussion – any changes likely to fall on individual groups (which haven't been convened yet) – expectation from JCAP that each group will come up with their own structure and guidelines before next JCAP meeting. Some discussion as to how often these groups will be meeting – A. Warmoth will check back.
- Committee agreed to take on alignment of resources with mission through the rest of the year.
- GE Subcommittee Chair has agreed that three core curricular themes will be agenda for that subcommittee.

Senate Budget Committee: no report

#### **Discussion Item #1:**

Revision of program review procedures at EPC

E. Newman's proposal for a revised internal procedure for program review: In the past, sense that EPC thorough review procedure has been repeating a lot of the work already done by departments and outside reviewers; she proposes that EPC ask departments to provide a two-page executive summary for the committee's review – then hold off on a response and process multiple program reviews as a group/batch, to see what is uniform about what they are reporting, etc. – then provide summary report to APC, Provost, etc.

Discussion of the balance of a higher-level look at whole programs, vs. value of discussion departments derive from discussion with EPC (EN notes the discussion would still happen, just not the letter) – also questions of efficiency & prioritization of business before EPC, and keeping EPC as a meaningful step in the process.

**Discussion Item # suspended** for time certain:

#### **Business Item #1:**

Geology Dept. change to name and requirements of major, included in handout – guests Matt James, Michael Smith, and Dan Kramer

Revised BS degree has already been implemented, and it & the BA were nearly identical except for math & physics requirements – so they have now revised the BA, changing the name to Earth Sciences, for students heading toward a variety of career options. Have supporting letters from Chem, Math, ENSP, hoping for one from Geology Dept at SRJC, as students could then get an AA in Earth Sciences at SRJC for a direct transfer route. They feel these revisions bring the BA into better balance with the BS, and providing a broader view than traditional Geology.

Discussion of unit counts, particularly as they relate to GE pattern and the clarity of how the units are represented in the sample 4-year plan. Overall lots of support for the proposal.

First reading concluded, they will come back 11/18.

### **End Business Item #1**

### **Business Item #2:**

Early Start proposal – guests Kathy Kroll (English) and Sam Brennan (Math)

a) Draft proposal to the CSU – deadline is 11/19, day after our next meeting. Review process is being done in parallel at the Senate. EN states that this IS an academic program, even though it has been mandated by the Chancellor, and so is subject to the same requirements of program review etc.

TS described the materials in our packet: the draft proposal, two appendices, resolution that he's drafted, he passed around a substitute that's been amended by the Math Dept. without objection; the English Dept. voted to approve unanimously; similar resolutions from other institutions follow; and Sam's handout re: Math Council of Chairs resolution.

Numerous issues with the program proposal going forward; remaining issues for campus to review consider: questions about access for students, and resources (this is unfunded by the Chancellor's Office)

KK notes current mismatch between high school curricula and ours – at high school level, not rhetorically based critical thinking – the EPT tests their ability to create thesis-driven arguments, and was designed simply as a placement test, not a requirement to pass/proficiency. This threatens to bar students from CSU, because of requirement to take extra class in summer.

Discussion of the requirement for students to submit proof of enrollment vs. completion of course; questions about how different campuses would report non-completion/"good faith efforts" to complete, or how much completion would constitute "enough" – was deliberately left vague.

TS: there is also a disconnect between the mandate (begin in summer, complete by end of 1<sup>st</sup> year) and what's happening on this campus, in our move away from "remediation" to year-long freshmen composition (and one semester accelerated composition)

LM: motion to waive the first reading, seconded (LW) – passed unanimously

b) Resolution: TS feels its pretty self-explanatory – last three clauses are SSU-specific. Questions about phrase “pedagogically sound”; English dept. added that phrase due to concern/goal to protect new stretch curriculum being implemented this fall. Further discussion/fine-tuning of language.  
TL moved to change “that” to “to,” and add “that meets Chancellor’s mandate” – seconded (AB); change passed without opposition.

Resolution to be sent forward to Senate – passed unanimously.

## **End of Business Item #2**

## **Discussion Item #2**

New MCCCCFs – should she sign? Yes

## **End Discussion Item #2**

## **Return to Discussion Item #1**

Back to discussion of program review procedure – EN assumed this new procedure would require a memo from EPC to let departments know of the change –she’d like our support to bring that draft to us (done.)

## **Discussion Item #3 (added by TS)**

English Dept. offering 21 major courses (4-7 fewer than needed), also scheduled Freshman English, lots of temp. faculty – Dean of A&H has said that freshmen in the dorms are a priority for planning (take preference over majors) – hence have been asked to reduce from 21 to 18 major courses, which means linguistics classes not offered, some single subject track students may need to stay an extra year, and resources would need to be reconfigured.

It is time to have a discussion re: prioritization of freshmen; this is a process of program discontinuance by strangulation – so EPC needs to get involved.

Invite Dean of A&H to explain planning presumptions? Also the provost? We will try to address this.

## **End of Discussion Item #3**

Meeting adjourned.