

**2016-17 FACULTY SENATE
GRADUATES STUDIES POLICIES COMMITTEE
MINUTES**

September 6, 2016

Approved: September 20, 2016

Members Present: Bogazianos, Bradley, Cowan, Hembree, Lindsay, Newsome, Pinch, Shimabukuro, Topping, Wassmer

Members Absent: Vargas, La Rocco (ill)

Guests Present: Michaud, Endriga

a. Call to order: Called to order at approximately 8:35 a.m. [Note: Due to a miscommunication, Bogazianos was told by someone in Sac Hall that GSPC would have to leave Room 161 by 9am; while GSPC was able to conduct all of its scheduled business at the meeting, the agenda was reordered according to the most time sensitive topics first. The minutes below, therefore, reflect this reordering.]

b. Approval of Agenda: Approved as reordered.

c. Discussion Items

a. New Business: EO1071

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee had asked multiple Senate policy committees to provide feedback concerning changes to EO1071 within one week; therefore, EO1071 was the first topic of discussion. During the discussion, Bogazianos read Statewide Senator Miller's email giving some context to the changes, and Dean Newsome also provided further context. Members shared a number of concerns that can be summarized thus:

1. Section 5 (Policy Compliance) of the draft policy states that the "Chancellor's Office may de-authorize any subprogram that does not comply with CSU policy," but no process for de-authorizing subprograms is mentioned, alluded to, or outlined. The lack of any de-authorization process (including timelines for subprograms to get into compliance; paperwork required; etc.) seems problematic for transparency, shared governance, and faculty control of their own curricula.

2. Section 4.1 of the draft policy makes the following significant change to existing policy: for years campuses have had to simply "notify" the Chancellor's Office via email prior to implementing new subprograms, but the new draft will require campuses to "obtain a Chancellor's Office confirmation" before implementing any new subprograms. Again, however, no process for "obtaining confirmation"—e.g., what responsibilities the Chancellor's Office has concerning paperwork, timelines for notification, etc.—is mentioned, alluded to, or outlined, which, again, seems problematic for transparency, shared governance, and faculty control of their own curricula.

3. One of the "Proposed Changes to Executive Order 1071" states that "Subprograms must require less than half the discipline-related credits in degree major programs." It is

unclear, however, how this requirement makes sense for Graduate programs, which, according to CSUS policy, are required to have 9 of 30 units as “core” classes (less than half), leaving 21 of 30 units for possible sub-emphases (more than half). Graduate-level concentrations requiring more units than the “core,” however, may be highly important and logical since graduate education has higher-order professional-level goals that might necessitate more unit variance in order to be achieved. In short, it is unclear if this “one-size-fits-all” requirement makes sense for graduate-level education.

4. It’s somewhat unclear if a “minor” is considered a “subprogram” along with “options, concentrations, special emphases, and similar.” The wording of Sections 1 and 3.1 suggest that they are similar and therefore require the same level approval, but Section 4.3 states that “There is no requirement to notify the Chancellor’s Office of new, modified or discontinued minors.” In addition, Section 2 states that “Subprograms are not defined at the system level.” In short, the draft suggests that subprograms are not defined at the system level, but then treats different kinds of subprograms differently (i.e., options, concentrations, and special emphases seem to be treated differently than minors). Perhaps some definitional clarity is needed, since different bureaucratic processes appear to be triggered depending upon which labels are attached to which subprograms.

While members shared the above concerns, Pinch did note that having accurate federal data concerning majors and concentrations is highly important even with such concerns. Bogazianos promised to pass along the Committee’s concerns to Exec at the next meeting.

b. Action Items

- a. Election of Vice Chair
Troy Topping was unanimously elected
- b. Selection of liaison to Graduate Council
Geni Cowan was unanimously selected
- c. Selection of liaison to Curriculum Subcommittee
Kath Pinch was unanimously selected

c. Information Items

- a. Report from Chair
No report
- b. Report from Graduate Dean
Dean Newsome alerted the Committee to the existence of a CAT/CIM implementation group, and asked if GSPC would like to have a representative on it. Members were instructed to let Bogazianos know if they were interested, then Bogazianos would contact Newsome. Newsome also noted that CAT/CIM changes need to be given to CPC by the implementation deadline of November 8 2016.

Newsome also discussed the creation of a new Graduate education task force, and asked committee members to suggest areas of concern that might be addressed. Members noted a number of key concerns to graduate education, including faculty workload and resource issues; graduate student resource issues, such as increased grad student workspace, increased student funding for conferences and research

(Shimabukuro); and the larger issue of what the CSU, and CSUS' overall mission for graduate education is or should be, given that only 6% of students at CSUS are in graduate education (Pinch).

c. Report from Statewide Senate

No report.

d. Discussion Items: Plans for 2016/2017 legislative actions

Members discussed legislative goals for this AY, and agreed that revising the grad GEAR; revisiting issues surrounding graduate program review processes; and possibly creating a clearer thesis reader policy were the highest priorities for the season.

e. Open Forum: Wassmer brought up the fact that GSPC's efforts to draft policy concerning the creation of Blended Bacc/Masters programs are still, despite numerous communications otherwise, described in public discourse as "accelerated" programs. This continues to be a problem since the Blended Programs policy clearly outlines how Title V requirements prevent any reduction of minimum units (120 for bacc, 30 for masters), thereby contradicting the notion that blended programs are "accelerated." A number of members agreed that this is an ongoing communication issue, much of which probably began with the 2012 coded memorandum from the Chancellor's office, which referred to such programs as "4+1" degrees. This is an ongoing issue.

There was no other business.

Adjourn: Meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:15 a.m.

Dimitri Bogazianos, Chair, GSPC