

Minutes: Educational Policies Committee
11:00 AM – 12:50 PM, November 12, 2015

Present:

Laura Watt, Tim Wandling, Kathryn Chang, Nathan Rank, Melinda Milligan, Kristen Daley, Chiara Bacigalupa, Alvin Nguyen, Olivia Smith, Luisa Grossi, Richard Whitkus.

Absent:

Charles Elster, Laura Krier, Jen Lillig

Meeting called to order by LW. Agenda approved. No minutes to be approved until next meeting.

Reports

1. Chair of EPC — L. Watt

- a. GE subcommittee has been working on the GE proposal forms that EPC commented it on last Spring. They are making progress and can be finalized in its next meeting. So it will come back to us in the future.
- b. Senate budget committee is trying to figure out which question to ask the administration - how to reconcile the CFA recent report on budgetary issues. At least according to them, we spent the least on instruction of any CUS campuses. The administration was asked to comment on that and (the response) was “some of the numbers were not accurate because they were not doing the analysis right. The committee is trying to figure out how to ask the question, what is wrong with the analysis so we can figure out how to compare these things. They will invite several of Larry’s staff who in the past have been really useful in terms of trying to figure out those issues such as how our bookkeeping different than other CSUs, so as to get to where we might have a less apple to orange comparison. They also had an idea of, maybe the comparison we need in addition to how do we compare right now to other CSUs, was also looking into longitudinally how is our budget, especially the proportion spent on the instruction, changes on our campus over last ten years. Obviously, we went through the big budget crunch during the financial crisis. The part of why the CFA reports resonated to a lot of us because it sounds like it describes our experiences having larger classes and fewer resources and faculty.
- We discuss the budget.
- c. At the last ExComm meeting, the structure and function committee has recommended merging APC with the senate budget subcommittee to give that the new committee (in charge of) academic planning and budget. It is trying to reconstitute it in Spring. Now that has been sent back to FSAC to rewrite the charge for the committee. LW supported this, she thinks it is important to have

somebody on the academic planning side. EPC has been dealing with some policy stuff but we can't fill the whole gap that was APC. That would give that committee a clearer charge that was previously a bit murky. Bring planning and the budget together makes a lot of sense.

- d. The ways in which the state bonds and debt we have for buildings now will be held by individual campuses, rather than by the state as a whole. That is expected to make it much more difficult for any capital projects to go forward because we are not only to take on the debt ourselves in addition to the debt we already have, also we have to have certain amount of budget for the project upfront. This would affect any new buildings as well as the upgrades.

2. Interim AVP, Academic Programs — R. Whitkus

- a. From our discussion with ESP and also with our catalog processing team. The catalog has to be the official word of what program is. We are finding from ENSP and also other programs, the catalog just says, "see our website for current condition"; that is not going to fly anymore. If it is not in the catalog, it isn't in the ARR. That makes harder for students who think they're being advised by the program and get everything done and they go to graduate and find out that "I don't have the requirements and all these substitutions have to be done." So please get the word out that you need to make sure that what is in the catalog is to be followed. If you have things at websites, that is fine; but make sure then it goes through program changes and is approved by me and the faculty governance. Therefore, all individuals including students know what the requirements for the program are. We're also getting from outside, as JCs and other colleges saying that we don't know how to advise our students to get prepared because the information is not in your catalog. We are also finding that information that is in the catalog sometimes varies from what is on the website for the department.
- b. CSU on line courses- Low/upper GE. We have more students taking these on-line courses than other CSU campuses. The issue is these courses count toward to the residential courses, and it starts to affect our residential program. A number of CSU campus are worry about that. It doesn't count for a major's course unless the major has articulated that course within their major. If a student takes that course about the articulation, then could course petition and major can do a course substitution. You have to think about how many courses do you want students take at another CSU that count towards your major courses. We start to have that question: how many courses taking outside of our own institution that should count toward to the residency?

KD: I have a question about JC articulation. We agree that a 3-unit JC course can account for a 4-unit SSU lower division course through the articulation. Because

a student is missing one unit, the box is red instead of green. But we've already agreed through that articulation that the box should be green?

LG: They only get credit for the units they take at JC through transfer credits. It is up to the department to decide.

LW: We have a similar issue in our department when the ARR requirements were constructed, they put in unit requirements for the major that we actually never paid attention to because some of our classes vary and we don't care about the number of units of this class or that class, as long as you are taking the class...I think within the ARR, can't they change it so they are not unit requirement but course requirement?

LG: Yes

MM: What's the maximum units students can take from CSU online each semester?

RW: they can take one course each semester.

3. Vice Chair of EPC – N. Rank

I'm actually headed today to Seattle going to the AACU meeting. We are going to present a poster. Will let you know how it goes. The meeting is mostly concerning the novel ways to practice education in the universities. I also see AACU has another meeting about assessing GE coming in Feb. It would be a good idea for someone to go. I've got a lot from the meeting last time I went a few years ago.

5. Liaison to GE Subcommittee — T. Wandling

About GE proposal form. The snag on that form is that section that says what the school committees should be doing. Last year we saw that form, we had language on that form something that in effect of "it should be routed to the schools...Social Sciences. Somehow that language disappeared, and I don't know why – that has never been voted on by EPC or GE. What I want to suggest is "consult the curriculum guide about the proper processing for these courses." The importance of that form is to provide experimental and permanent process. Heather Smith and the rest of GE want to look at RAF? requirement. Maybe to defer that question in some way, look at the curriculum guide for what schools it needs go to, so at least we get the form done; and I think that we just keep bouncing back and forth. Where Heather left off is giving them two weeks to think about it, then will come to this room for action.

Consent items: GE and non-GE MCCCCFs

LW: There are various consent items posted on Moodle. I need to add one more experimental course, non-GE, from Geology; it came through this morning.

All approved.

New Business:

1. Revisions to Music concentrations (B. Wilson) 11:00 TC

BW: we offer 4 degree programs, BA in Music (BM) with 3 concentrations, Jazz studies, applied (performance) music, and music education. We also offer BA in Arts – more general degree. We've been nationally accredited since 1972. We need to do 10 year major self-study documents. In fall 2017, a visitation team will be here spending 3 days to exam the documents and we will put on an concert for them, etc. As we went through all standards and found out that we have to make some adjustments to our curricular program in order to meet the NASM standards.

For BM degree in all three concentrations, this is the issue of the private lesson. Students in the program have to have one-hour private lesson, currently they are getting a half-hour lesson. The instructors are currently going overtime without getting paid. To fix that, we need to change the CS code for a course called Applied Music Studies. This then will generate the one-hour lesson time for the BA in Music students in all three concentrations and will increase the pay for the teachers as their time will be compensated. Our dean has a letter in the pack that specifically addresses that. We really quite relieved that by changing CS code, we are able to address this issue. The BA in Arts students still take a half-hour lesson, which is called Private Instruction because the performance expectation is quite bit less for BA students compared to that of BM students. BM students will take Applied Music Studies. These two courses will have two different CS codes.

BA in Music degree program is a high-unit major. We really do not want to add more units. By changing the CS code, the total units are up by only one unit instead of 8 units if we would have considered adding courses.

Another way we are accomplishing this is embedding the freshman learning community into the major (8 units). We actually are doing this for last couple of years but the catalog does not reflect that. So we bring that forward. This satisfies A3 and C3. It is the requirement for the major. We already have the C1 required in the major. That the freshman learning community has been really great for us, having all freshman majors in there together as a cohort, it just builds such a great community; and it gets to satisfy these GE areas and it worked very well.

So that is part of our proposal. Even we are doing it but don't know how to program it into the ARR without going through the formal process. These are the two main areas. Then the bulk of your attachments has to do with the music education concentration. We make these changes by creating certain requirements for instrumentalists and certain requirements for choral people →

resulting total units up one unit in the major to 132 units. This is typical for Music Ed. Students. The program is also approved by CCTC (California Commission on Teacher's Credential).

For example, all students are currently taking three semesters of conducting, one for general conducting, one for choral conducting, and one for instrumental conducting and methods. We are finding now that it is just not enough time to cover the content we need to cover and be in the spirit of NASM and CCTC. The new plan is that everyone takes the general conducting class, only the choral students take the choral conducting and only the instrumental students take the instrumental conducting. Then we split off the course of instrumental conducting and methods into a new course where we isolate just instrumental methods portion. So instrumentalists take instrumental conducting and instrumental methods so we give the time that is really needed for them to be successful band directors. Similarly, for the choral program as well.

LW: Just a reminder for everyone since a lot of information is not in the packet, but on Moodle, including proposal, EPC form for each of three concentrations, 2 courses under Jazz studies, also the performance concentration that is just changing the CS code, 6 courses with description changes, one with the title change, 3 new courses for the music education concentration. And we've got sample syllabi for all of these. Hope you have a chance to read these. So we are on first reading on this? Any clarifying questions and issues about the structure of the proposal that you want to bring it up.

OS: So goes from a half-hour lesson to an hour lesson, why the units stay the same?

BW: by changing the CS code, it generates more instructional time. The CS code for the old one is 25 that generates .25 WUTU for the professor. So they are teaching this private lesson for each student, they get .25. Change to the CS code to 36 yields .33 for the professor → it will justify the one-hour lesson for the BM students.

LW: it is similar to lab classes where the amount of units does not match the time in class; the time in class is longer. Other questions, comments, or suggestions?

TW: There are lots of documents here. I think for a lot of documents, you might cut and paste some of the things you said here today on everyone of them, like the rationale for doing this, accreditation, etc.

BW: It is all in there for each concentration. We repeated it.

LW: It is on the revised program summary near the end of document, but not numbered.

TW: A related question is: are you hiring in the future? Do you have flexibility to do different things?

BW: We have a search going on this year. We are not replacing. Part of what that person going to be doing is replacing the retired position. Our new hire is doing the learning community; it is working great.

LW: Any other actions take on this one?

MM: I don't know if it is worth doing it because there are three programs; they all have lots of detailed changes. I was just try to parse out, before and after with each of them. I know you have explained the major changes very clearly. But I don't know if it is worth going through the documents since we are in the first reading, quick explaining why the changing units for each category, I don't know if you want to spend time do it or not?

LW: We have the time.

BW led the committee through the side-by-side program comparison for each item for all three concentrations. He explained why the unit changes and answered any questions raised by the committee members. NR suggested to include the range for total units line, instead of "# units plus prep". On BM-Music Education Concentration item c for current program, LW suggested to change to 4 hidden units of A3 and take out "and C3". CB suggested adding a couple of sentences about student learning outcomes, replacing with "no change in the assessment".

LW: I know there are three separate proposals, it would be helpful you can do a general paragraph or two about why you bring these changes forward so it would make easier for us to walk through the documents. Next round will be on 12/3 meeting.

2. Revision to Minor in Political Science (C. Nelson) 11:45 TC

CN: It is a proposal to make a minor revision to Political Science Minor by adding C grade pass for the core courses that are in the minor. The chart shows the difference between current and proposed program, showing just adding languages that require C pass for the courses. The major has already have C or better requirement to pass all of our core courses (about 5-6 core courses). Our intent is to increase the rigor of the minor by adding the same requirement just for the core courses (POLs 200, 202, and 201). The requirement is also the same as the university GPA requirement in major course work, so we don't feel like we are being too challenging but a nice balance here. There is no change in resources, no impact on student learning outcomes and assessment strategies. Even though these three courses are GE's, there is no change in GE status of the courses; only to the courses as they applied to the Minor. Basically, we neglected to do this for the minor when we did it for the major.

RW: for the upper division courses in Political Sciences that will be taken by the minors or now currently taken by the majors, do any non-major or non-minors take these courses or these are really taken by PS majors?

CN: Most of our upper division courses are taken by Political Science majors but they are open to anyone who wants to take them. For example, Pols 345, Modern UN, there is a trip to New York involved, instructor permission required, there is a little bit screening, we'd like our students have some background in international relations, whether or not our 304 course or some other backgrounds. So we have had non-major students in those courses.

RW: Have you been having any problem with those students if they have not received a grade with C or better getting into those upper division courses? I've just been learning about how this works. And apparently, from the catalog and ARRT?, we have troubles coding these specialties for just these. What you doing is all those upper division courses now have new prerequisites? The prerequisites is basically a grade of C or better is required at these low division courses. And can't you make that difference between the majors and minors vs. non major/minor students. That is actually very difficult. So I just wondering have you had any students who are not majors or minors wanting to take these upper division courses saying that "I can't get in because of I don't have the prerequisites of a grade C or better?"

CN: the only formal prerequisite we have for upper division course is the methods courses, Pols 302 to get into our senior seminar of Pols 498. Both of them are core courses and are restricted to the majors for the first enrollment run; and they are always filled by just the majors. The rest of our upper division courses have no prerequisites so students can get in.

RW: I would like to hear from the department perspective. What I hear the way that works at ARR is the courses actually have a prerequisite added on to them that is a grade of C or better to get into this upper division course.

CN: they are not prerequisites. Pols 200, 201, & 202 are just major courses. All we're saying is you have to have a grade C or better in that class to complete the minor.

RW: I miss read that.

MM: Students can take courses in any order to finish.

General discussion about grade, requirement of a grade of C or better for GE's "golden four".

LW: we have a motion to wave the first reading --> going into second reading.

RW: "The proposed revision would require a grade C or better to pass in the lower division core courses." What is the pass?

CN: to get the credit toward the minor.

RW: as much as making it credit /no credit, you need to have C to get credit. I understand the point, but the pass is a D in grading a course; you are changing that by saying that a pass is a C.

NR: it would be better the change the language in the rationale. "The proposed revision would require a grade C or better to receive the credit towards the minor." Additionally, I wouldn't necessary agree to the last sentence in the second paragraph; it is not the same because it is the minimum of an average. So I don't think you really need this sentence at all; you've already explained the situation.

MM: a few minutes ago, Catherine gave the example of what would've happened to a student who got a D, I just want to make it explicit that the same thing would also happen to a student who receives a C-.

TW: You're actually making a good point that we have a minimum 2.0 GPA in major courses. Is it in fact your attempt to have students taking these earlier on in the program? Melinda pointed out that students can still take that in their senior year, not making it prerequisite. It does saying that to pass it with a C to get into upper division course.

CN: Where does it say students have to pass with a C to get into a upper division course? Yes, the intent is to take 200 level courses prior going to upper division courses. It is preferable; we advise students to do that.

LW: you may want to change the last sentence in the last paragraph to "receive credit for the minor", as well as the first sentence in the second paragraph referring to the major.

NR: Out of curiosity, is this intended to encourage students to retake these courses or is it intended to encourage students who didn't make the grade to seek out a different major? Is there a seat available for that student (who wants to retake it)?

CN: That had not been a factor in our conversation because students can take Pols 200, we generally offer 10-12 sections every semester, there is a maximum enrollment of 68 students in each section. So generally there are seats available. With Pols 202, we restricted to majors and minors in the first week of enrollment. We recommend majors to take this class, although they can take 200. After the first week, we lift that cap and let others to register. We also let students retaking the class in community college because it is American institution GE transfers so there are a lot of alternatives should students want to do that.

Motion to pass. Second. No discussion of the motion, all in favor and it passes unanimously.

3. *Revision to Early Childhood Studies major and new concentrations (C. Bacigalupa) 12:00 TC*

CB: We are in the fourth year of this major, it is much bigger than we expected, probably around 350 students. We talked to students regularly and during the exit survey. We are really surprised to find that 40% of them have no interest in going on any kind of educational capacity. They want to be psychologists, councilors, child life specialists in the hospitals. There is a lot of special education, but not in an educational setting. We are aware of that they are spending 8 units in curriculum courses; these curriculum courses come with the field placements, and they are asking us why can we do this in something that is focused on what we want to do eventually. It feels kind of awkward in that we are not exactly meeting their career goals. We start thinking about what we can do to help those students have an experience that makes more sense to them.

- 1) First we thought why don't we make these two curriculum courses as electives? That doesn't work because we want to be accredited. Accreditation comes with its own set of rules. We can't do accreditation right now because the body that does the accreditation isn't set up for the four-year program the way that we work. They look at us as a pilot and I am sure at some point that we will put this accreditation into the fact. The school of education is always looking at the accreditation; it all works together. So what is the accreditation means? Accreditation for us would mean that if we have an education track, which is accredited, and the other would not be accredited. This creates a need to have two concentrations: early childhood education and early childhood development. Taking 8 units of curriculum courses that have integrated into them field placements would become two different development courses and 2 units of field placements. The reason why we separated them now where they didn't get separated in our curriculum courses because students' interests are so diverse, it didn't make sense for one instructor to figure out how to talk to students who would go to so many different placements within an integrated course. With a separate course, we figure an instructor could do that pretty easily. At 8 units, students in education concentration would not take development courses; and students in development concentration would not take education courses. We are not adding anything; those students would now do something else.
- 2) We are looking at electives. Students love the fact that they can choose different kinds of electives. That works really well for them, given the variety things they want to do. But there are courses around the university that we didn't know about, thus not approved for the major or the new courses. Students are taking these courses and we fill out a lot of course substitution forms. So that part is just about saying that our students are doing this and we would like this to be in the catalog on the list so ARR can accurately give them credit and we don't have to do course substitution forms.

- 3) Adding one unit introductory course so the entire major could go from 42 units to 43 units. Why do we need this? a) We have a portfolio that is a good program assessment. But from the student's perspective, it comes to the very end. They have to have most of work done in order to be in that class; we make them to take it in their very last semester. What happens is no matter how much we talk to them along the way, they are shocked and dismayed to discover that we are actually asking them to go back and think about what they did in those courses. It is funny because in the courses they actually put their work in the portfolio as they go. It is not like they never heard of it, but they're just not prepared, their reflections are not very good, and they are not able to pull things together. We thought we start them off at the beginning with a portfolio class may be helpful. b) All different faculties, when students are putting their assignments in their portfolios as they go, have to be piecemeal say, here is the piece of software you need, here is how you buy it, here is how you put into it. It would have been easier to have one person doing that. c) We have a lot of field works for them and they are going out working with students. We asked them to read our handbook but we're finding out that either they didn't read it or these rules were not sticking well. So we want to put the professional behaviors into this course so we have one person telling them that these are very important too. The one unit course would be pretty big, about 45-60 students. We probably need only 1-2 sections every year. In terms of resources, what we are going to do is to take two-unit worth of electives that are no longer offered. I think that would make a big change for our students.

KD: Could that class be taken in Jr year?

CB: Yes. We told them take it right away.

OS: Once you ace that class in the freshman year, and the idea is to build a portfolio until senior year and kind of flow back to that class?

CB: Yes, they are already doing this; they're just not very well prepared for it. They take a course, the instructor says that make sure you put this particular assignment into your portfolio. And they do that and it is relatively simple at that point. We don't love this way building the portfolio, but that was the way the accreditation requires that we determine what the assignments are. So they do that and they don't really think about that too much until they take senior portfolio course. Then they go back and have to answer some specific questions like "what do you know about working with children and families?" "what are the main principle you have to think about?" They have to think about it and reflect.

A general discussion about major electives, resulting potential SOCI catalog changes, etc.

LW: We are going to look at for the second reading in our next meeting.

Old Business:

1. *Revision to Career Minor in Museum and Gallery Methods (J. Shaw) 12:30 TC*
Career minor in Museum and Gallery Methods – revised proposal

LW: This is a second reading. As you recall, we had our first reading of this in last meeting and we asked the proposers to make a few refinements to their proposals and changes.

JS: we've added a descriptive section in the beginning. We noted the learning outcomes and the assessments are the same. And it doesn't require any additional funding that was not there before. We have some details about internships, these internships are on-going. We put the old and the new side-by-side so they are easy to see and condensed the rationale into first a summary and then a description of the changes in the course numbers and titles.

MM: On the side-by-side comparison, would you put the total units for the right-hand column too before it goes to the Ex Comm.

Approved with a minor change of adding total units. It passes unanimously.

Adjourned: 12:50 PM

Respectively submitted by Kathryn Chang