

Educational Policies Committee
Minutes: October 25, 2012
Recorded by: Carrie McDade

Members Present: Carmen Works (chairing for Armand Gilinsky), Jeffrey Reeder, Terry Lease (proxy for Armand Gilinsky), Melinda Milligan, Lillian Lee, Mary Dingle, Andrew Gallino (Associated Students Executive Vice-President), Christina Baker

Agenda should reflect 2 additional New Business items:

1. New GE course proposal -- NAMS 165: Native American Lecture Series / Mike Smith (GE) and Leny Stroebel (NAMS Coordinator)
2. Experimental course review -- AMCS 390 (Independent Film Studies) / Mike Smith (GE) and Christina Baker

Agenda approved.

Minutes from October 11, 2012, approved.

Reports:

1. Chair's Report / Carmen Works
 - a. Senate Budget Subcommittee is hoping to initiate a dialogue around Prop 30, and what Schools and Departments can do to save money; save the date – Nov 30th – for faculty “meeting” to plan for Fall 2013, which Faculty Chair Margie Purser is planning and promoting; one thread of discussion that has come up is the “fear” of vocalizing ideas for the fear of losing that which has been brought up; an idea (though unlikely to implemented per President’s comments) floating around has been that of cutting the position of Deans and having Chairs report directly to the Provost; another idea (which has not been commented on by President) is the collapsing of Schools/Departments –perhaps more likely is shared leadership within Schools whereby fewer Chairs oversee more programs/Departments/etc.
 - b. Anticipation of new Chancellor White
 - c. \$200K originally earmarked for out-of-state recruitment was put toward classes
 - d. Catherine Nelson’s report from the statewide Senate noted recent resolutions (1) 120 units and (2) extra fees for excess units moved from 16 to 18, 150 units cap, repeat, and limiting repeatable units to 15; unclear how this will work; and AP and junior college transfer credits outside the new fees; brief discussion of the “super seminar”; Andrew Gallino added insight into when these will be voted on
 - e. Noted increase in cheating / plagiarism / disruptive student behavior on campus
 - f. Discussion of safety issues around skateboards and bikes on campus (no policy, no bike paths)
 - g. Highlighted the get-out-the-vote event for students today (Oct 25)
2. Liaison to/from APC / Lillian Lee
 - a. Noted recent presentation to APC by Professor Matthew Paolucci Callahan (PSYC) on “Assessment 101” which was followed by shared experiences and discussion about what role APC should have in changing assessment practices on campus and getting faculty on board and supported; CW commented that faculty often understand assessment to already be in practice / in the pedagogy (e.g., lessons, assignments, exams, etc.); LL responded that MPC indicated this but also

highlighted that this was not across the board practice; not all faculty have the tools and support needed and the rewards / consequences are not there either; MM inquired about the distinction between assessment of learning outcomes and course content (LL responded that MPC was referring to the former) and emphasized the need for training, including defining outcomes, goals, and objectives (not the same) and how these play out at different levels (school, program, department, course); MD noted the necessity of a *purpose* for assessment

3. Voting member of Program Review Subcommittee / Mary Dingle
 - a. No report.

New Business:

1. Experimental course review -- AMCS 390 (Independent Film Studies) & revision to Minor in Film Studies / Christina Baker and Mike Smith, GE Subcommittee
 - a. MS provided the context for this experimental course review ... GE approved the 2-semester delivery of AMCS 390 (Independent Film Studies) which meets C1 in the GE pattern at 1 to 3 variable units; the course addresses the GE Subcommittee's goal to incentivize 1-unit courses, though Area C is generally designed for 4-unit courses; the Senate is voting on this form today (Oct 25)
 - b. EPC Committee raised the following concerns/questions:
 - i. CW. Noted there is no proper syllabus, and asked how faculty would earn workload credit
 - ii. TL. Concerned for GE course with *no* instruction, the direct linking of a GE course to a major course; and the relationship between units and input
 - iii. MM. Noted the great opportunity embodied in the course, but echoed the above points (referencing the unit alignment to lecture series in WGS Queer Studies); recommended a generic syllabus to bring the issues to light, add more rigor, and account for faculty workload
 - iv. JR. Also shared concern for GE appropriateness, and suggested that the number of units to time input may fall short of official code and asked if this was a required elective for the minor
 - v. MD. Suggested that instruction could be delivered via course readings (v. direct instruction)
 - vi. MS. Suggested 1 unit (rather than 1 to 3 variable)
 - c. CB responses to concerns:
 - i. The course was intended to be an Independent Study, which typically has no formal instruction
 - ii. The course could introduce an overload for faculty, but not a major concern as it would be limited. CW again expressed strong feeling that any overload, no matter how small, should be counted.
 - iii. Not required for the major, but a required elective for minors
 - iv. MS added that GE was somewhat concerned about limiting this GE opportunity to a small population and the alternative of opening it up to a broader but less prepared student population (that is, those without proper background in film analysis/studies), though emphasized that it was experimental in nature
 - d. EPC asks CB to prepare a sample syllabus, as well as to account for more instruction, structure, and rigor, and the means to account for faculty workload

2. NAMS 165: Leny Stroebel, NAMS Coordinator; Thaine Stearns, Dean of the School of Arts & Humanities; and Mike Smith, GE Subcommittee
 - a. MS provided context for this new course review ... GE has approved with no concern for the course content and SLOs, but is concerned with format and delivery, namely it is a large lecture course and proposes large breakout sections (150 students, 4 graduate teaching assistants to lead breakout sessions of roughly 37 students); given that staffing and resource implications are outside the purview of GE, this is now being presented to EPC for consideration
 - b. EPC concerns / questions included:
 - i. JR. What depts or programs will the graduate students come from?
 - ii. CW. Noted her experience with the challenges of large discussion sections, and expressed concerns for inexperienced graduate students leading them
 - iii. MM. Raised the issues of 50% lecture time v. 50% breakout discussion time – that is, half of the course is being taught by the graduate students
 - iv. TL. Posed the question that if the model for this large lecture format exists, then perhaps it's OK to proceed as proposed. JR followed up by saying that the large lecture/sub-large lecture is presently in the GE model, so this is not the real issue but what is problematic is the prominent graduate student leadership
 - v. MD. Asked for more details about the support and training for graduate students and their relationship with the course curriculum – is there a job description? What are the requirements, the expectations? Is there a procedure for mentoring and training.
 - c. Responses to these concerns / questions:
 - i. LS has contacted the Anthropology Dept for interest; students will be paid a stipend; NAMS has already tried something similar which produced positive evaluations through informal conversations but the course/sections were not peer evaluated
 - ii. Dean Stearns reported on the numbers: 4 graduate students at \$3,200 each / total of \$12,840; if 50 students enrolled through Extended Ed then there would be funds for 2 more graduate students but otherwise there are no other resources available;
 - iii. LS said that graduate students would work directly with faculty Greg Sarris
 - d. Summary 1.
 - i. Given the time constraints and meeting agenda, there was discussion about moving the discussion and vote to email
 - ii. LS was asked to retrieve the graduates teaching assistant job description as well as more information about how assistants would work with Greg Sarris, and how instructor of record would be given workload credit for student training /mentoring
 - iii. Dean Stearns and LS indicated that a decision needed to be made within the next 48 hours to get the course into print; discussion about how to proceed ensued and given the availability of the players, it was decided to revisit this topic at the end of the meeting (see Continued Discussion and Summary 2 below).
 - e. Continued Discussion.

- i. Dean Stearns broke down the general practice for release and asked if the question at hand was about how faculty use TAs? CW countered that the question / discussion centers on the quality of education.
- ii. MM. Upon reviewing the job description, noted relief in seeing that graduate TAs would meet regularly with GS but expressed deep concern over the fact that TAs would not be required to attend the lectures. LS responded that the TAs would be given all the readings; MM countered that this was not the same / not a replacement for absorbing class content via lecture attendance
- iii. Dean Stearns emphasized that this was just the type of course format that GS has experience with teaching elsewhere.
- iv. MD. Asked if TAs could receive some other type of credit (in lieu of pay) for their time attending lectures.
- v. TL. Asked LS to confirm confidence in securing quality graduate TAs
- f. Summary 2.
 - i. CW suggests a vote given the time.
 - ii. TL moves to waive 1st reading. JR seconds the motion. No discussion to waive. Approved with 7 in favor and 1 oppose (MM)
 - iii. JR. Summarizes the present key issue -- mandatory lecture attendance for TAs; CW suggests addressing this in the language ("preferred," "several" are currently in the job description); Dean Stearns presents the question of whether students in the MA Spanish program (for example) would be given credit towards their degree for such TA activity. JR says likely limited credit could be given.
 - iv. TL moves to approve the proposal. JR seconds the motion. Motion approved 7 in favor and 1 opposed (MM).

3. Review Academic On-line Policy / Deb Roberts

- a. DR. Provided an introduction to and context for APC's charge to draft an on-line policy for SSU
- b. Notes indicating collaborators and consultants will ultimately be removed from the document but remain there as indicators of who these individuals and units were
- c. Shared a "fear" faculty have presented – that faculty will be forced to teach online courses [DR: this is not so; online instruction is not new]
- d. Policy is purposefully redundant
- e. Inclusion of IT support may not reflect present situation, but included because it is in fact a requirement / demanded
- f. There was brief discussion about FASC leading a new SETI policy, which will need to address online courses
- g. MM. Suggested that faculty be required to prepare an "archival" printable version of syllabus as in her experience tracking syllabi from online courses can be problematic, particularly in the case of reviewing transfer courses and for assessment purposes; DR responded that APC will address this by adding the verbiage "on record per policy"
- h. MD. Requested that the course schedule / catalog indicate if a class is online and that the term "hybrid" was missing in Section IV of the policy draft.

- i. CW. Asked for clarification of Section IV. A.3. – which deals with contracting with private or public entities to deliver courses.
- j. DR. Invited EPC to forward additional comments.

4. School Name Change, School of Extended *and International Education* / Mark Merickel, Dean of School of Extended Education

- a. Dean Merickel presented context for this name change request (detailed in the documentation provided) and the interest to better reflect the merger of the School of Extended Ed and International Education
- b. CW and committee unsure about formal process for hearing and confirming a school name change, but proposed to proceed as a first reading
- c. MD. Expressed concern that the proposed name conflates two different things and suggested “School of Extended Ed and International Studies”
- d. Dean Merickel responded that there was some push-back to the insertion of *and* as well as an interest to keep the new name concise; he indicated his preference for International Studies over International Education; he likes MD’s proposal and will present it at the upcoming Deans’ Council
- e. JR. Inquired about the impact of the merger on student opportunities given that SSU has historically strong participation; Dean Merickel responded that SSU follows CSU international policy for countries, approvals, etc., and while it will be hard to initiate new programs, existing ones will be maintained
- f. CW asked for 2nd reading with the proposed “wordsmithing” for next meeting, and by then, the committee will have followed up on the formal procedure for confirming a name change at the school level

Meeting Adjourns a little later than usual, around 1:00pm.