

Education Policy Committee Meeting

March 4, 2011

Provost's Conference Room

11:30 to 12:30 p.m.

Present: Jan Gasco; Mary Brooks; Tracey Haney; Helen Chun; Pat Kalayjian; Joanne Zitelli; Cathy Jacobs; Michael Galant; Mitch Maki; and Jill Aguilar.

Gasco welcomed everyone and said that the meeting came out of concerns expressed by a faculty member. Gasco is also serving on UCC and so she knows they are working on revising forms and the curriculum guide. She said that the goal of the meeting was to address faculty concerns and to identify ways that the curriculum review process might be improved. There is concern about so much of our memory lying in people but there is no official record. There was a short discussion about improving efficiency and then a talk about concern regarding course syllabi.

Richard Kravchak who was not able to attend had said that he thought the syllabi should not be looked at during the curriculum review.

One problem is that many details about courses are filled out incorrectly on the forms, which leads to delays. To save time we could have it so that the blanks were automatically filled in correctly on these forms.

Haney said that there are not sufficient resources to do the programming so that the blanks are filled in automatically but that something called the course master file has units, course number and title of the course abbreviated. The full title is in the catalogue.

There was discussion about the current forms which are in word format. Haney said that you only have to write in what is different and not what is the same.

Haney showed us the long way to look at courses and the new report streamlines it and she can distribute the report. Anyone filling out curriculum forms should check with their Dean's Office where the course master file can be accessed to avoid minor errors.

Gasco asked if there was a mandatory meeting in the fall for the curriculum committee and Haney said yes but not this past year because we thought all the chairs were the same.

Zitelli said that this information is hard to find on the website and Haney said that it is on the academic programs site. Gasco suggested the title be changed to curriculum review and that might be easier to locate. Haney will ask that both the subject "academic programs" and "curriculum review" be added to the alphabetical listing of subject on CSUDH Home page of website.

Gasco asked if colleges notify Haney who is on their curriculum committee and Haney said that her office tries to find out. They make several phone calls and sometimes they don't find out until January. Gasco noted that she had difficulties learning from some colleges who the Curriculum Committee chairs were.

Haney asked Jacobs if they should do procedures for curriculum revisions. Jacobs said yes-- at the beginning of the year. Haney and Jacobs agreed that each Fall semester they will meet with College Chairs Councils and College Curriculum Committee chairs to review the curriculum review process.

Haney asked to change to a writable PDF and Jacobs said to make sure we take down all the old versions of all the old forms. The new forms will be writable PDFs and instructions for each part of the form will pop up when accessed. The new forms will be rolled out over Summer 2011, and faculty are asked to begin using the new forms for Fall 2011, but during Fall 2011 old forms also will be accepted. Beginning Spring 2012 new forms must be used.

Gasco asked what kind of record keeping is done by curriculum committees. Jacobs said that CAH has a register where the information is logged in. Also, Galant explained his own recording procedure through the use of a Word file that contains a table. He will share the format of the file, and other college CC chairs can use it or adapt their own. The benefits of systematic record keeping by curriculum committees are clear. Not only will it help to keep track of proposals, but the records can be consulted if disputes arise.

Gasco had asked if minor changes could be submitted online. Group agreed that in the case of minor changes curriculum committees could make those changes without everybody having to go back and make changes and resubmit the entire proposal

There was discussion about whether we could just fix things in the course of a meeting. Haney said that we do fix things (referring to UCC). Gasco said that a lot of corrections could just be done orally during meetings and if there is one little problem we should not have to resubmit the entire proposal. This also illustrates why it is important for faculty whose proposals are being reviewed to attend both college curriculum meetings as well as UCC because many small problems can be fixed during meetings.

There was some discussion about the music department proposal that had taken over two years to get approved. They had a complex proposal, so at first certain details of the proposal had to be clarified and missing paperwork had to be obtained. Subsequently, when requested changes were submitted to Kravchak, Kravchak in some cases made revisions to the incorrect version of a form or submitted new syllabi rather than revising the previously submitted syllabi.. Galant said that his directions are very clear. He later added that part of the delay was that it sometimes took Kravchak several months to submit revised documents. Kravchak had said that the syllabus review should be left up to the department chair. He also was concerned that only syllabi going through curriculum review were ever checked. Gasco said that it would be impossible to monitor every syllabus every semester. Jacobs noted that the current system inevitably results in the review of most campus syllabi eventually. Maki noted that because of WASC requirements, there has to be a campus-wide body that reviews course syllabi.

Maki said that he was uncomfortable telling the college curriculum how to run their committee. He agrees with Jacobs we have to review the syllabi, syllabi is our agreement with students. If there is a mistake like a D- (a grade we don't give) and it is on the syllabi a student could file an appeal. Maki said that with big program there is a lot of back and forth. Streamlining isn't the answer if we are going to have incomplete information. Maki said that he would be glad to do any small changes that he can do.

Aguilar wondered if the committee is there to help faculty get proposals through or are they a barrier. She noted that there is a perception that they can be a barrier. Zitelli said that she notices a delay when she has to consult with other departments.

Haney passed out flow charts and she went through the process. There is the fast track where all must be ready as soon as you make the proposal such as faculty, space etc. The MFA program could not go through fast-track because they have to go through accreditation.

Haney will send the forms to the group to look at and get feedback.

Specific suggestions and solutions from meeting

1) new forms will be live PDFs and will have pop-up instructions; new forms available over summer 2011, and will be required by spring 2012)

2) Haney and chair of UCC and USLOAC (currently Jacobs) will meet with College Chairs Councils and college curriculum committee chairs each fall to review curriculum review process, which can include

- reminder about “course master file” available through Dean’s offices
- suggested record keeping tips, see #4 below
- encourage early election of college curriculum committees during Fall semesters
- encourage faculty submitting proposals to attend college curriculum meetings and UCC when their proposals are under consideration

3) new links to “academic programs” and “curriculum review” will be placed in alphabetical list of subjects on CSUDH website homepage to make information easier to find

4) a model Word file for college curriculum committee chairs will be made available to better track activities related to specific proposals

5) colleges are asked to elect curriculum committees early each Fall semester

6) curriculum committees can decide how to handle small corrections, but one possibility is that small corrections are made during the course of meetings

Meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m.