Educational Policies Committee
Minutes
9/18/2008

Members Present: C. Works, B. Bryant, S. Cabaniss (SC), M. Clark, S. Cunningham (SCu), M. Pinkston (Proxy for K. Hatch), T. Kelley, L. Morrow, J. Wingard.

Liaisons Present: R. Coleman-Senghor,

Visitors: Catherine Nelson, Michael Ezra, Scott Miller

1. The meeting was called to order.
2. The agenda was approved.
3. The minutes were approved minor edits.

REPORTS

1. CW reported that the Art Therapy discontinuation had it's first Senate review, and that it is schedule to have it's second review at today's Senate meeting. CW stated that we have access to the most recent list of program reviews, but that we cannot designate a two member team for each review until the department contacts CW.

2. CW reported for Elaine Sunderberg recommending we support Rose Bruce on CLA., which should not conflict with our expressing concerns over the program. Support institutional research office.

At this point, RC expressed concern about the issue of ATI (Accessible Technology Initiative) and thinks EPC needs to respond to it. CW reported that Brett Christie has been invited to report to EPC about ATI on 10/4/08. As that date may be too late for EPC to submit comments, it is suggest that Emiliano Ayala be invited to EPC to speak about ATI if Brett Christy is not available sooner. SC noted that ATI was discussed at last APC meeting, specifically concerns about ATI's impact on required books and textbooks. CW noted that she would check the APC minutes and contact executive committee. It was also noted that FSAC should be contacted.

3. JW reported from the Graduate Studies Subcommittee that early closure dates had been announced. Additionally, he discussed the curriculum guide, describing it as a "nuts and bolts" how-to resources with information about what faculty do to change or discontinue curriculum.

4. CW reported from the GE Subcommittee stating that the group is actively working on learning objectives and continue to move along with the program review. CW reported that the Provost attended last meeting who stressed concern that the committee was not going to complete the job. Discussion followed that noted that curriculum is under faculty control and that the emphasis of the GE committee is on freshman programs, as well as "shared" governance is what needs to be stressed. There was a question about

“Distinctiveness to GE” —What do other CSU’s state under distinctiveness? What does this mean CSU-wise.

5. RC’s report from the APC was suspended until the next EPC meeting.

BUSINESS ITEMS:
1. CLA
Catherine Nelson provided information to EPC concerning CLA (Collegiate Learning Assessment). Catherine informed EPC that the same concerns have been raised statewide on the issue of how the test is administered and whether or not the results are valid if students are paid to take the test. Catherine recalls hearing that some campuses are embedding the test in the curriculum as a voluntary option, and some are paying students to take the test.

There have been two workshops for faculty/staff in Summer 2007 on how to embed this assessment in the classroom. 40 CSU faculty attended these workshops in Long Beach.

A question was raised on when the timeframe has elapsed on this 2 year pilot and it was noted that we are at the beginning of year two: 1st year was 2007-2008, 2008-2009 is the 2nd year.

RC noted his concern, setting aside the adequacy questions, with the way the CLA is put together: Does the kind of test measure critical thinking in a valuable way. Discussion followed that noted that CLA is showing to the general public that we are accountable and transparent. What is the value that we add at SSU? How does that value compare to other schools?

CW stated that we are charged to draft a resolution, in addition to stating whether or not we endorse the testing per Rose Bruce’s request. Katherine noted that the EPC does not need to endorse it per se, but to acknowledge it. The group examined the amended (12/11/07) Resolution Regarding Administration of the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) and agreed to change the wording to remove the resolve clause from “supports” to “acknowledge.” The addition of “and reviewed for the pilot period” is to be added to the end of the third resolved statement. CW noted that KE will make these changes to the existing electronic version of this document. Discussion of new language of this document will be held at the next EPC meeting, and perhaps forwarded to the executive committee.

2. RC mentioned the ad hoc sub-committee within APC formed to address the President’s response to the vote of no confidence. He noted that this committee is perhaps an experiment in communication. APC is discussing the response with the ad hoc committee as a way to move it forward, but it needs to go back the Senate for any actions.

CW noted that we need a liaison for the Senate Budget Committee, especially in this time of budgetary uncertainty. She noted that it has not gone unnoticed that we do not have liaison on this committee. We are still leaving this open for now.

3. Mike Ezra from American Multicultural Studies provided an introduction to a proposal for a Minor in Jewish Studies, an externally funded and interdisciplinary program. He noted that they have had 2 semesters of Jewish Studies course offered on an ad hoc basis from funding ($30K) received last from a donor.

JW asked if Mike felt confidant the funding will continue to which Mike stated that there is never complete certainty, but that fundraising has be very strong. He noted that SFSU just turned their Jewish Studies minor into a major, and feels that the money is out there. He said we are confidant. Mike discussed the funding as including an endowed chair.

SC noted that this program sounded like an endowed program, not specifically just an endowed chair. What other arrangements are like this on campus? Is there going to be a paid coordinator? Mike informed EPC that he is the paid coordinator, and that he received a one-time fee of $8000, one time fee.

SC suggested presenting a 4 year plan and provide a clearer picture on how the money is going to be spent. RC expressed concern over the issue of the functions of the program coordinator and their continued activity: is that work overload? Exploitation? Mike mentioned that he considered it University Service.

SC noted that the program will need someone for continued fundraising and wondered what money the division will get for students attending these classes from student fees? She also asked if they would you be willing to try this program for a 3 year project instead of a permanent minor?

CW noted that this is a first reading for the Minor in Jewish Studies and that answers to these questions can be discussed at the second reading. We will put this on the agenda for next time.

4. Senate Chair Scott Miller joined to report from the Senate stating that he is making the rounds to bringing greetings and to inform the committees of what he hopes for and the new Senate Chair. As chair, in general, he stated that he is very business oriented and that he trusts all the committees to do their work well. On that note he mentioned that he is forwarding the process to Sara Moulton to end the Art Therapy program.

Scott distributed copies of the WASC executive team letter to President Arminana, and asked every committee member to bring this letter to their meetings and note the 6 EER (Educational Effectiveness Review) points the WASC team provided. Scott feels that this list hit the nail on the head and gave us a good list of things to keep in mind as we move forward with our business.

Discussion noted that the timeline in which the University is expected to make progress is until October 2009

SC inquired what the Senate is doing concerning the about the first listed item concerning “recent expressions of concern” and “strengthen the sense of community”? Scott mentioned the ad hoc committee formed to discuss and draft a remedies document. He noted that they are reading President’s response, and along with other committees, will respond back.

SC noted that this confirms that the EPC is charged to look at the President’s response and discuss it. It would be helpful for the Senate give us guidance in how EPC can respond to this letter. Scott responded that the executive committee will be happy to provide guidance as needed.

5. CW stressed that it is important for us to provide meaningful feedback to our program reviews. We are the last stop in review process. We will work in two person teams to: make sure all documents are there and in proper order, supply comments, draft a letter that expresses concerns, provide a discussion to give the department closure over any concerns or needs, and have letter finalized and sent to the Provost.

BB inquired if we function as advocates for the departments? CW stated that we are there to make sure the process is done right and to provide feedback. RC soes not see us as advocating any program, but that we have a descriptive function. MC mentioned that describing what programs are doing can be a role of advocacy and wondered if we are keeping track of the pattern of identifiable needs and concerns? CW responded that we track technological needs. CW inquired if the committee wants to invite Larry (last name?) and Sam (last name?) to discuss this EPC roll with us.

The meeting was adjourned.

Minutes submitted by Sheila Cunningham