

From: Carol Van Vooren <cvanvoor@csusm.edu>
Subject: Re: The UCC review of
Date: April 11, 2017 at 12:00:34 AM PDT
To: Sajith Jayasinghe <sjayasin@csusm.edu>, Patricia Stall <pstall@csusm.edu>

Hello Jay,

Thank you for your review and your thoughtful questions. Attached is a new document that addresses your concerns.

1. I added an additional clarifying sentence in italics after Question 1 description.
2. This statement, "In addition, there are no changes in admission requirements" is added to the response to 4b.
3. The Question 6 template is specifically about the state support program, however, I added "While it is recognized that this section pertains to questions regarding program elevation for self-support, it is clear that this elevation is also requested for the stateside program" immediately after the title for Question 6. I added a few other supporting comments throughout Question 6.

Let me know if there are additional changes or additions needed.

Best wishes,
Carol

Carol Van Vooren, Ed.D.
Associate Professor, School of Education
California State University San Marcos

From: Sajith Jayasinghe
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2017 3:35:06 PM
To: Carol Van Vooren; Patricia Stall
Subject: The UCC review of

Dear Carol and Patricia,

I am writing on behalf of the UCC with regards to the program elevation proposal for the MA in Education, Educational Administration option. The UCC had the following comments:

1. Q1 in the Option Elevation Template - include a sentence stating that the option exists in both stateside and the EL programs and that both options are being elevated.
2. The table on page 6 of the proposal clearly indicates that no curricular changes are taking place due to the evaluation of the option. The committee would like to confirm that no other curricular related changes, such as entry requirements, are not being made to the catalog description.
3. For Q6 the committee suggests including a statement which clarifies the existence of both state support and EL options, and the differences between the two.

Since this option elevation requires the proposal to be sent to the Chancellor's office the proposal will need two readings at Senate. The committee will be able to get the proposal on to the Senate calendar for 4/19/17, which would allow for two readings, if we receive clarification to our comments by 4/17/17.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Regards,

Jay
Sajith Jayasinghe
sjayasin@csusm.edu
<http://public.csusm.edu/jayasinghe>
Associate Professor of Chemistry and Biochemistry
ASC Faculty Liaison to the CSM (16-18)
Departmental Biochemistry Faculty Advisor
University Curriculum Committee, Chair 16/17
California State University
333 S. Twin Oaks Valley Road
SCI 2 - Rm 115
San Marcos, CA 92096