

EPC Minutes – October 24, 2019

PRESENT: Christina Baker-Foley (CB), Kristen Daley (KD), Kathryn Chang (KC), Sheri Schonleber (SS), Matty Mookerjee (MMo, Acting Chair), Brian Burton (BB) for Emily Asencio (EA), Luisa Grossi (LG), Katilin Springmier (KS), Melinda Milligan (MM), Edie Brown (EB), Malissa Kader (MK), Katie Musick (KM), Stacey Bosick (SB) ABSENT: Jennifer Lillig (JL), Karen Moranski (KM)

Approved agenda with changes

- New business items - Do #5 after #3

Approved 9/26/19 Minutes

I. REPORTS

Information items Report on switch to Curriculog (TC 11:15 K. Manwiller) KM: we officially start using Curriculog in last couple of weeks. Everything from Hellosign was transferred over. So far it goes really well. I know most of you has logged in. If you know faculty that don't have the role assigned, let me know the email address. From this morning's report, we have 18 course revision proposals, 9 GE course revisions, and a couple of program revisions. We just finished implementation and we are ready for future revisions.

DISCUSSION MMo: Trying to do updates for the 2nd readings, there seems to have custom things you must go through? KM: The proposal originator can continue edit it all the way through in Curriculog. The reason why you couldn't edit yours was because I took it from Hellosign, I'm the originator. Once we have passed proposals that were transferred from the Hellosign, we will not have this problem. MM: Can you talk through what's options are for setting up the alerts? KM: in progress – request for switching on email verification and deleting all of ones prior to today. You can go through your settings and update notifications and how often you want to get them.

Stacy Bosick – On Karen's behalf (AP)

- There was an active discussion (AVP meeting at Chancellor's office) about ethnic studies as a CSU wide requirement, where would it go in the GE. There wasn't a resolution on this. Discussion on making it in the D area or American Institutional requirement; some reluctance making it as an overlay.
- University Studies curriculum committee is looking at FLC in the Spring and recertified those. Dean Kennedy (Director of Residential Education and Campus Housing) is interested in putting UNIV150 on hold next year while the curriculum is revisited. There has been a concern from University Studies and Academic Programs on a declining participation from new TT faculty. I proposed to have a workshop / meeting in Spring and bring faculty who

are interested in the revision process and think about whether it makes sense to use the Sea lanes to weed through the residential program. Dean wants to ensure the residential FLCs are truly integrated with the rest of the curriculum and the faculty overlapping with the rest of faculty of the University. It could be anything, such as Met-in-Major, Sea Lanes, it's up to the faculty.

Discussion:

SB: about 150 students would end up at the regular FLCs but continue to live in the resident hall (so does the advising faculty). KS: that would mean we'll offer more regular FLCs (150 extra seats?); I would think about the impact of FLCs we do have, how advising would work? SB: as currently stands, there are many students are doing both residential FLCs and campus FLCs - part of reasons why the curriculum needs to be revisited. EB: advising is not required for FLCs and UNIV 150. If we put UNIV 150 on hold, that wouldn't necessary mean that more FLC seats must be available; it would mean more stand-alone GE courses in A3 and C3, potentially A1 would have to become available. Orientation becomes challenging in that students are in FLCs and in stand-alone critical thinking courses or C3. That's orientation advising issue not the advising around the FLCs or UNIV 150. KS: I agree. But I was trying to remember the language in new GE curriculum related to FLCs. FLCs must open to all students or be available to all first-year students? The intention is to make sure there is a FLC available. MM: to Stacy representing the administration, that Social Sciences from funding perspective hasn't been participated in FLCs. FLCs were strongly discouraged for funding reasons. The culture hasn't been changed. Social Sciences does not do FLCs. There is a starting conversation move toward that direction, but I think it would be funding driven. If we need more FLCs, there is a mismatch. Ideally, you would want Met-in-Major links to all schools. I think Social Sciences wouldn't have one right now unless there was a lot of redeployment of resources. SB: are you talking about FLCs generally or residential FLCs? MM: both MMo: we feel the same way in Science 120. We just did a big assessment. KD: most of FLCs are in A&H.

APARC

CB: a new module coming out in the fall; MMo: is that coming through us? CB: not sure if we have to vote. MM: I think it is an interesting question that whether EPC thinks module changes are curricular? Whether we should look at them if you want to report what potential curricular consequences would be? CB: there was a long discussion about the new hours, whether it should be blocked out, what to do with the lecture series, etc.

II. CONSENT ITEMS

1. MCCCCF's for ANTH596C – approved.

III. OLD BUSINESS ITEMS

1. 2nd reading-Minimal adjustment ES (F. Farahmand, TC 11:30) FF: ES proposes adding new courses to the existing electives pool to the catalog. Several current elective courses have not

been offered in six years due to lack of faculty expertise and students' interest. The updated document addressed questions raised in the first reading. We added a table showing the changes - a side-by-side comparison and went over several syllabi and made sure everything was correct.

MM moved to approve, CB seconded, unanimously approved.

IV. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

1. Proxy for Kristen Daley for SDS meeting on 11/1 (Friday, 2-4pm) MMo: nobody here can do it; will ask those who are not here.

2. Approval – WIC courses MMo: what do we need to do specifically? MM: WIC courses are approved semester by semester basis because the WIC standing isn't linked to the course itself permanently. The WIC list must come forward (for EPC's approval) but has already been vetted by the committee (?). It is procedural only. KMk: in the future, we'd like to consider adding "w" or "wic" after the course number (e.g. ARTH 450w or wic) and make it clear to students; such changes will need to be approved by EPC. MM: is there any reason not to do it behind the scene? KMk: not I could've seen. Everything would have been done at scheduling (w/ WIC verification) instead of after the fact. However, if a department wanted to change a course into a WIC course after schedule looked like, they must schedule a different course. MM: they would still need to go through behind the scene, the WIC committee to verify all the different criteria because the department wouldn't have the expertise to check off the list of criteria. If we do have an ad-hoc committee for overlays, it would be under its purview and spearhead this WIC approval process.

CB asked about a WIC course that is not on the list. SB thought every course that is offered would be on the list and offered to check.

Approved.

3. GE SubComm Memo Re: Area E Language adjustment KS: this is a memo from GE asking to slightly modify the language in the Area E content criteria requirement because as we see more E courses coming in, we had some difficulty with how the criteria states that courses integrate to the two following aspects of

3

sociological, physiological, and psychological. The most difficulty is with the sociological aspect because in the field of sociology, it could be very particular discipline. Sociological address the scholarship that examines how the concept of self-identity are constructed through the social system in its entity. E as was intended in the EO1100 language is looking at social aspects of itself, teaching students the different social nature of both learning and development. We're asking to change that language to E must "integrate at least two of the following aspects of the

self: social, physiological, and psychological” and also included some language that was crafted very well by Jeff B.; we don’t confused in the future when we look at these courses and when people are proposing courses.

Discussion:

MMo: What courses that preempting the latest discussion but just examples where this is come up? KS: This has come into conflict in more recent courses than the one we had on the agenda today. We look at ANTH 240 very early, the question about E content material wasn’t pull out from it because we saw a lot of criteria integrated into its learning outcomes. Science 220 course started the discussion; we couldn’t find a sociological aspect of itself. SB: now we’re looking for social. How are they learning by working in teams, how are they learning by working with community partners? MM: Jeff B (Social Science rep on GE) – certain courses GE was approving pending clarification of this language. I want to make sure we didn’t approve the courses that meant social but not sociological before approving the language change. That’s why I was curious about the list of courses that GE found that meant social but sociological. KS: ANTH240 (1st reading 8/22; 2nd reading 9/5) MM: EPC has to figure out what is the language is before approving ANTH240.

Also, there was a discussion about definitions about social and sociological and whether the existing language “sociological” was shifted (from EO1100- social) accidentally. LG mentioned that It was accidental, trying to match physiological and psychological and wasn’t intentional; SB thought that was GE Subcomm’s take and that’s why it is willing to put the proposal up to EPC, as long as it was an accidental shift.

KD moved to approve the language change and adding the definitions, SS seconded, unanimously approved.

MM: This change was clear-cut. Just wanted to remind the committee that when these changes come forward from GE, it is reasonable if you want to have consultations with your school curriculum committee. Some future changes might be more controversy and have implications. From the process perspective, we should consult our constituents around the future changes and be more transparent to the campus community. Also, EPC should go through 1st and 2nd readings before voting. KS: I agree. For any future changes, GE will send a memo to EPC. EPC can decide if reaching out community is needed.

4. GE Content criteria B3 KS: B3 is a lab. GE revision documents state that the lab component can be offered as one unit or 3+1 lecture &lab, so there are three documents, B1+B3, B2+B3 and B3 as a standalone one unit. We thought the combination ones, the instructors would only need to submit one signature assignment. Content criteria (2) haven’t changed a lot from the original draft in language. There were some questions about the word “ethics” in our content requirement.

There is a confusion about what we meant what we want our student to collect ethically. So, we changed to the procedure of the discipline to be clearer – what we considered as minor changes in the content.

MM: I pulled this. I thought EPC, rather see this as a consent item, should hear what was happening at GE around these content areas as they come through and be more informed. MMo: do we need to hear about other two? KS: the other two are very similar, they just included the other areas content criteria that were already approved and just merging multiple documents.

MM moved to waive 1st reading, CB seconded, unanimously approved. KS moved to approve 2nd reading, KD: seconded, unanimously approved.

5. ANTH240 GE documents KS: it is a summary document at GE Subcomm. 1st reading – learning outcomes, clear course guideline documents.; 2nd reading: focus on the learning outcomes MM: did you talk about which two of the three aspects, sociological, physiological and psychological? KS: in the course content criteria document, it called out this course addresses sociological and physiological, things about global health issues. We took that statement to interpret this course as fitting of E-ness. MM: now sociological is social. You could still say, from GE perspective, that it fits? KS: I would say yes. My interpretation of changing to social is just making a big umbrella for more courses.

MM moved to waive 1st reading; KS seconded, unanimously approved. KD moved to approve 2nd reading; KS seconded, unanimously approved.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Status Discussion a. AB 1460 Senate Response (MM, Laura Watts TC 12:15pm)

MM: The statewide senate has asked for input from the campus senates around a proposed system-wide Ethnic Studies requirement. Our senate is in the process drafting a memo (due 11/1) and needs EPC's input. Statewide discussions (2016-17) about Ethnic Studies across campuses are included in the folder "Ethnic Studies Memo for EPC". There is a bill, AS3397, in the state legislature that would institute a statewide Ethnic Studies requirement. State senate's argument is that it would be better to impose a

5

system-wide Ethnic Studies-type and to have control over what that requirement looks like, so they are seeking input on how to proceed with that process.

Our campus could provide that input through summarizing our experiences with Ethnic Studies, now Critical Race Studies discussion that happened last spring. The memo does take a stand (prefer campus-based over imposed from the state legislature, see second paragraph of the memo

for wordings).

DISCUSSION: support for legislative solution by imposing a state-wide Ethnic Studies requirement and concerns over how flexible each campus would have over control of the course content and curriculum development are present.

LW: The concern about the legislative approach is not so much about academic freedom for individual faculty; it is about the faculty's prerogative to set the curriculum. I've heard strong feedback - It is the faculty to determine the curriculum not the legislators. That's the rationale why we craft the memo stating that we, representing the senator, are not in supportive of legislative solution but would rather see a state-wide self- imposed requirement.

Possible changes to 2nd & 3rd paragraphs of the memo, along with the definition language (6th paragraph) are discussed. Anyone wants to have input on the language, please email to Laura/MM before 3pm today.

- b. GE and Community engagement – what kind of feedback have we gotten and where might we go next?

Community engagement

MMo: SST Curriculum Committee is much more in favors of an “or” option as oppose to adding it to the list. We would have 4 overlays if adding community engagement. MM: either global or sustainability. Make it that part of list, being overlay on the overlay requirements – overlay onto the overlays? MMo: that option was not well regarded. MM: even though it would mean students could do community engagement and not do sustainability or global, that was better. CB: not sure if the committee (A&H) discussed. The A&H fellow's message was supportive of bringing the community engagement into GE. I've not heard from the curriculum committee to get a general sense of what others (felt). MM: I talked to the Social Science fellow who emphasized that even though the proposal on the table is a community engagement requirement, she would advocate for a service- learning requirement. She felt that the scope of community engagement was so broad that many of things could fall in the community engagement (e.g. volunteering) that would not sufficiently meet the intention of the requirement. She thought the goal of the campus should be narrower and be service learning only. What would count for community engagement versus service learning? The community engagement is a great phrase, there is a lot of discussion about how that relates to service learning, service learning is simply a pedagogy or not, etc. If the requirement is service learning, what fills it other than it's just a pedagogy? CB: I remembered Merith talked about the distinction when she was here. It would be helpful to have those examples. MM: If service learning is one way to do it, what about other ways? MMo: service learning tends to be resource heavy; there are a lot of things we must do to keep those relationships with the community and make sure students are getting that as well. If it is made a

requirement of everyone – may not have the capacity to do that. That’s why having a less restrictive “or” option was preferred at SST. Forcing volunteerism is problematic in general. It should be an option chosen by the students. SS: We have many students work. Personally, it would be a heavy burden on students. MM: The conversation at Social Sciences is going to be about the challenge of the option that SST has described. GE program has already watered-down sustainability and global rather than having them to do as separate requirements. Adding the third to that further water down the commitment we had to any one of three. Are we committee to all these evenly? Do we not care which one student do? Or does the campus have the commitment to one of these three being more important in terms of being the signature SSU experience? MMo: that’s tough question to answer. Having people in other side that claimed that they are all important. MM: Practically, how many of these we could add on? So why these two meshed together at the last minute anyway. MMo: there is one other option that Jenn sent around, 2B? make more sense from our standpoint. MM: from Social Sciences, service learning is a pedagogy and cannot be a requirement. If you go with community engagement, what fits in that category? If we are not clear on that, how can we figure out how to incorporate it into the curriculum? Should be one of three legs as you describing? Should be an overlay? I think we need that info to move to the next step. MMo: Is someone spearheading the proposal? MM: EPC agreed to return to the issue when EPC talked about the GE program last spring because Merith’s concern. CB: we may want more clarification about community engagement vs. service learning (from Merith) before moving on. I could send her an email. KD: Is service learning as a pedagogy a Social Science thing, or a different philosophy? MM: Majority of GERS has decided service learning is a pedagogy; it didn’t make sense to make it as a stand-alone GE requirement. If it is community engagement more reasonable, what is community engagement other than service learning? BB: my own university has a website that has the definitions on what is community engaged learning and what is service learning. I can send the definition link to the committee. MM: the phrase “community engaged learning”, not community engagement, may help the conversation going.

c. Discussion of EPC guidance for online course offerings?

Not discussed.

Meeting adjourned at 12:50 pm Minutes submitted by Kathryn Chang

