

Curriculum Policies Committee 2016-2017
1:30 – 2:50 PM
Sacramento Hall 161

Minutes for Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Approved: February 21, 2017

Present: Baldus, Biagetti, Burke, Chalmers, Croisdale, Fell, Ingram, Keck, Lin, Murphy (Chair), Mort, Newsome.

Absent: Amata, Liu, Heather, Llamas Green, San Felipe

Guest: Jeff Brodd

1. Approval of minutes from Dec 6, 2016.
2. Information Items
 - Report from Faculty Senate and Senate Executive Committee Report (Liam Murphy): Items are due at end of March for policies this semester. CPC will look at eLearning, Assessment, and Supplemental Instruction policies. Senate Exec retreat in March; will discuss questions of pertinence to WASC.
 - Report from Assessment Policy working group (Liam Murphy): *Sub-committee may not finish assessment policy this year. Still working on new language.*
 - Report from Graduate/Undergraduate Dean (Chevelle Newsome): moving forward with catalogue project launch in mid-March/early April. EO 1071 (at least 50% of courses must be in core): looking at programs that may have concerns.
 - Report from Curriculum Subcommittee (Ben Fell): Have not met this semester; next Tuesday. No bottle-neck; will be looking at substantive changes forms.
 - Report from CPSP (Chloe Burke): first meeting of semester tomorrow, Feb 8.
 - Report from APROC (Ben Amata): absent; no report.
3. Discussion Items:
 - Old Business:
 - eLearning Policy (Murphy): shared input of Coleman from AITC. Intent of policy? Nothing in the policy should be included if it does also not apply to traditional instruction (ex: quality control issues). CPC may need to revise the survey developed last year on online/hybrid courses. Murphy will make edits to policy and bring back to CPC for review.
 - New Business:
 - Jeff Brodd (APROC): retreat for process of assessment. Happy with substantive process of program review. Main short-coming of program review is consequentiality. Showed table of CSU campus' program review. Only 3 campuses do not have an action plan as the end result of program

review. Some campuses also have reports from internal review and internal review with no vetting/review of the external review report.

Need to create a process that is more effective and uniform for Sac State involving department, review team, and external reviewer.

Possible model at San Luis Obispo: self study/review; peer review, and action planning. See: www.academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/general.

Dean Newsome suggested that new policy should make clear that both undergraduate and graduate programs need to be reviewed.

Murphy shared Amata's views that stakeholders need more communication in the review process; Brodd agreed.

APROC actions: develop a proposal to bring to CPC for review and approval and then take to Senate in early Fall. Brodd will also send links to all pertinent information on program review for CPC members to review.

4. Adjourned 2:50pm