

p

Educational Policies Committee Meeting Minutes

December 13, 2012

Present: Armand Gilinsky, Chair; Jeffrey Reeder; Christina Baker; Melinda Milligan; Mary Dingle; Sam Brannen(proxy for Elaine Newman); Carrie McDade; Elaine Sundberg

Call to order 12:00pm. Agenda reviewed; discussion included ...

- Gilinsky added to "Horizon" notes the likelihood of future "revisits" from John Kornfeld, Margi Purser, and Provost Rogerson.
- Brannen inquired whether or not the "Old Business" section should include discussion about undergraduate TAs (November 29 mtg).
- Milligan inquired if GE approved PSYC [### course ?]
- Sundberg followed up on the LIBS 208 (GE Area C1) course EPC reviewed via email; the registrar has sent an email notice about this course; additional GE Area C1 courses through CALS and NAMS will also be available when registration opens 10:00am on Monday, December 17th.
- Milligan inquired if UNIV 222 had added seats; Sundberg reported that some seats may have been added. Brannen revisited the concern for traffic and bike given the size and time of this course.

Agenda approved. Awaiting minutes from 11/29.

Report: EPC Chair (Armand Gilinsky)

Gilinsky reviewed his draft EPC Interim Report for the Academic Year 2012-2013 (refer to meeting packet), noting that the document does not yet include the LIBS 208 email vote. Gilinsky further noted that the CALS Major Multiple Subject Teacher Preparation Track (listed as #7 under "Curricular items and program revisions") is slated as a business item for the Senate meeting today (Dec 13). Gilinsky's interim report represents the committee's steady workload. Sundberg commended the report and said it would be good to share with Amanda McGowen as a heads-up for forthcoming curricular and catalog changes. Discussion continued about the need for faculty to submit their curricular revisions in the Fall (set a deadline) so changes can be worked into the following year's catalog; only critical curricular revisions should be active during the Spring (e.g., accreditation need). Dingle inquired about EPC's representation on the Program Review Subcommittee for Spring 2013 – will she remain in this role or is Amy Kittelstrom wishing to return? Dingle is interested in continuing, and Gilinsky decided for the purposes of the report, Dingle will remain the rep. Chair's report wraps up with mention of the Senate Resolution on the importance of graduate students.

Report: Director, Academic Programs and Graduate Studies (Elaine Sundberg)

Sundberg presented the committee with some notes about registration [refer to bullet point 4 above, under Agenda discussion] and said that Fall 2013 admissions Fall admissions are rapidly moving forward. The University began admitting incoming freshmen December 1, which is earlier than in the past and will allow students to plan their summer orientation and make payments. The campus anticipates another large freshmen class of 1,800, and another large transfer class of 900. Sundberg suggests the committee may see workload around the 120 units initiative in the Spring. She will be meeting with those departments and programs that are over 120 to develop strategies and/or articulate exception arguments.

Gilinsky shared with the committee a recent *NYTimes* article about the University of Florida's proposed fee plan with fee differentials based on workforce demand; that is, programs with lower demand would have higher fees while programs with higher demand would have lower fees.

Alvarez, L. "Florida May Reduce Tuition for Select Majors" *New York Times* (December 9, 2012).
<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/10/education/florida-may-reduce-tuition-for-select-majors.html?pagewanted=all&r=0>

Gilinsky asked if there was any news about the structural deficit. Sundberg said that \$2.5 has been identified and accepted and is now on the table for addressing. A number of strategies were briefly discussed. Sundberg confirmed the postponed (Social Sciences, Arts & Humanities) and ongoing (School of Education) Dean searches, and suggested that the Dean of the Library will likely not be replaced at the Dean level. Milligan asked about the process for Interim Deans; Sundberg believes they are appointed by the President. Brannen inquired about the ballpark cost for a new Dean; guesses were around \$20K to \$30K (not official numbers). Baker inquired about the likelihood of merging Arts & Humanities and Social Sciences; Sundberg replied that she had not heard of this moving forward and shared that mergers of Schools may not prove to be the best cost-savings strategy as demonstrated by the recent merger of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs (e.g., issues of workload, release time, chairs' salaries, etc.). She suggested the importance of considering needs such as interdisciplinary and collaborative work rather than purely financial when it comes to mergers. The suspended Dean searches (noted above) are less about merger potential and more about Prop 30.

Report: Voting Member, Program Review Subcommittee (Mary Dingle)
None; Dingle not present.

Economics Minor Revision (Steven Cuellar)

Cuellar presented to the committee the primary motivation for the revision: to attract more majors, to "beef up" the minor track, and to enhance analytical skill development, the latter a concern of employers. Milligan and Brannen posed several questions regarding the anticipated impact on enrollments, both for ECON 317 and elective courses. Cuellar assured the committee that there is no concern for negative

impact on enrollment and demonstrated this by providing numbers and recent trends. Baker inquired how common it was for the minor to be so structured and inflexible; examples of other minors were offered. Given the committee's satisfaction with the proposal, Brannen moved to waive the first reading; the committee unanimously approved. No discussion ensued for the second reading; Dingle called the question; the committee unanimously approved. Gillinsky will attempt to place this revision on today's Senate agenda to ensure it is reflected in the forthcoming catalog.

Non-Credit Certificates RFP (Dean Mark Merickel)

Dean Merickel presented the committee with the School of Extended Education & International Education's draft copy for an RFP for non-credit certificate programs, and explained the shift from credit-bearing programs to non-credit "skills-based" as a result of APC's charge to develop policy/procedures for new credit certificates. He expressed strong interest in working with EPC despite the non-credit focus

--Minutes from first half of meeting recorded by C. McDade; second half minutes recorded by J. Reeder

...Much of the previous work has not been updated in quite some time, such that the original documents come from 1977 and the current ones are from 1997. Dean Merickel says that all of the new proposals for certificates of any kind will come before a committee like EPC. There is a new certificate proposal form (currently online); they want to work with the provost and the faculty senate to review proposals. It's currently unknown what kind of workload this will imply, and there is some funding available (amount TBD, but probably up to \$1500), but it's after the fact. There are 3 certificates that the School of Ed. might want to bring, as well as proposals from the School of Bus. and Sci. and Tech.

AG: Asks Dean Merickel to look at the GMC RFP as a potential model. Also speculates on the possible implications for EPC if it is to be a body that makes decisions that carry funding.

MD: Suggests that there be an approval at the level of (at least) school curriculum committees. Dean Merickel says that this could be fixed easily by just adding.

ES: Suggests that with the present RFP proposal presented by Dean Merickel might not even need any approval at all from the faculty review bodies such as EPC – that it's a proposal for "development", not for approval or implementation. Suggests that this could be clarified by editing the document so that it's clear at what point a proposed certificate needs to be reviewed by EPC or other committees.

Dean Merickel: Came up with this process to be 'overly cautious' about sharing information with the faculty senate and its bodies. The current norm (across the

CSU) is that non-credit bearing courses, programs, or certificates do not need such review; on this campus it has just been an information item.

MD: Relates her experience as former chair of Ed. curriculum committee, where a faculty member would have been listed as instructor-of-record for courses that they didn't know anything about or that hadn't been vetted (they were CEU courses, not university courses). Asks where in the university courses would be approved if they're not associated with a particular program or department. Dean Merickel says that throughout the CSU, Schools of Extended Education have the authority and purview to offer courses (even credit-bearing ones) in cases where there is no offering from among the regular departments.

Dean Merickel thinks that it would be workable and appropriate if the approvals came to the dept. and school.

CM: Currently, faculty are continuously developing and creating courses that don't see any levels of approval until they are well-developed and ready to be reviewed, wonders if it would be appropriate to require that of these certificate proposals as well.

MM: Suggests that it would be useful to have at least the school curriculum committee chair 'sign-off' on these proposals

AG: Asks for an annual report (or equiv.) from Ex Ed that advises the committee about how many courses there are and what is their nature; not as a body that approves or rejects proposals, but simply to be kept 'in the loop' on a regular basis.

ES: Asks about what would be the case in situations where the 'proposing' entity is not a faculty member or a department but is some different, even outside, body. Gave an example of a certificate in non-profit social media development at SFSU to illustrate. Could/would EPC then be a review body for these types of programs? Dean Merickel: Says that SSU doesn't put out a lot of courses or programs that don't have direct alignment to academic programs, but some ExEd schools do at other universities. He thinks it's advisable to have all programs have a 'home'.

MD: Thinks that communication (from Ex Ed to the faculty oversight bodies) is the most important matter, and recommends the annual report mentioned above.

SB: Commends Dean Merickel for bringing this matter to the faculty in this way, and thinks that at least some of the suspicion on the part of the faculty may be because they might worry that ExEd courses and programs could creep into becoming an academic prerequisite or requirement.

CB: Asks for clarification that this process is being put together in a way that has approval at the dept/school level; then asks whether there is any standard about

meeting requirements or seat-time requirements – for example, a once-only meeting.

Dean Merickel: Responds to CB that there is no requirement or formula; although he personally wouldn't want to see anything that was very minimalist, but recognizes that it would be possible under the guidelines.

ES: Makes a suggestion about wording the proposal and clarifying it in a way that makes it clear that the call is first for proposals to be worked out, and then, after that, to the appropriate review bodies.

Dean Merickel: Will send an annual report.

AG: Adjourns. 12:53.