

Educational Policies Committee

4/8/2021

Attendees: Emily Asencio, Mike Ezra, Kathryn Chang, Sheri Schonleber, Kristen Daley, Matty Mookerjee, Kaitlin Springmier, Mary Ellen Wilkosz, Melinda Milligan, Joseph Lofton, Luisa Grossi, Katie Musick, Damien J. Hansen, Jenn Lillig

Call to Order

Approval of Agenda --Approved

Approval of Minutes --Approved

Reports

1. Chair of EPC —E. Asencio
2. AVP, Academic Programs —S. Bosick
3. Liaison to Graduate Studies Subcommittee-M. Wilkosz
4. Liaison to GE Subcommittee—
5. Liaison to University Standards Subcommittee—Vacant
6. Liaison to/from APARC-
7. Liaison from Senate Diversity Subcommittee —(Occ. Report)—K. Daley
8. Liaison to Overlays —M. Milligan
9. Liaison to GIG

Business

Consent Items: ANTH 348, BIOL 315 -- Approved

1. Electrical Engineering MS name change (See Curriculog) (Farid Farhamad) 10:05

Program has changed to reflect business needs and change in discipline over the years. Name change to reflect the changes in the program, and for better recruitment and advertising in the future.

Pulled from consent calendar to allow EPC to have an official vote, approved unanimously at other levels.

Question regarding any notable discussion at GSS.

M.E. Wilkosz reports no additional discussion.

Question regarding implementation date: paperwork states that changes will be implemented fall 21.

J.Lillig reports that Academic Programs will implement as soon as possible.

S. Schonleber move to wave the first reading, M. Milligan seconded. Approved unanimously.

K. Daley move to approve, M.E. Wilkosz seconded. Approved unanimously.

2. Bus 453, Bus 454 (See Curriculog) (TC 10:05) (Sergio Canavati De La Torre)

S. Canavati De La Torre could not make the meeting, primary discussion would be surrounding the school's online policy. Canavati De La Torre reported to E. Ascencio that the School of Business doesn't currently have an online policy but has a plan to develop one in the next academic year.

Question of whether or not the courses are time sensitive.

E. Ascencio reports that the courses are not, due to EPC's emergency 'blanket approval' of changes in course modality.

Question about emphasis of offering the courses online in summer semesters, wonder if that is an emphasis that will be pushed for all online courses.

Business moved to another meeting that S. Canavati De La Torre could attend and discuss.

3. Coun 501 (See Curriculog) (TC 10:20) (Silvio Machado)

Counseling Theories course -- focused on increasing student knowledge that would be applied in clinical settings. Exploring offering in online/hybrid formats, because students are really busy when they are assigned this course: taking 12/15 credit hours and working in clinics to fulfill a practicum requirement. The department has an online policy, which was shared with EPC.

Question on the clarification of hybrid for the online policy definition.

S. Machado states that the intention was for courses where instructors were teaching face to face and allowing students the option to zoom in.

Recommendation to S. Machado to clearly define synchronous and asynchronous online learning, in addition to hybrid teaching in their policy.

Question on best practices for teaching online in counseling pedagogy.

S. Machado states that there aren't discipline-specific practices, rather, the faculty are drawing from literature for best practices in online learning more generally. They are hoping to iterate the policy as they continue to teach online so that the policy can reflect a more nuanced understanding of best practices as they learn together.

K. Daley moves to wave the first reading, M.E. Wilkosz seconds. Approved unanimously.

K. Daley moves to approve, M. Milligan seconds. Approved unanimously.

4. EPC memo regarding course capacity (See Google Drive 3/18) (TC 10:45) (Napoleon Reyes, Ellen Carlton, Karen Moranski) and WIC criteria second reading continued (See Google Drive "WIC" and 2/4) (TC 11:00) (Scott Severson)

E. Carlton encourages faculty to take into consideration a course capacity memo which iterates that CS code has pedagogical implications and is therefore curriculum, and can and should be reviewed in faculty governance. In addition, Article 20: workload (20.1, 20.2, 20.3), the key wording to focus on is *past practice*. EP&R 76-36 provides policies for types of classes and class

size, and can be pointed to as past practice. It does not differentiate between face-to-face and online courses.

N. Reyes shares that when the CFA gets grievances about workload, it focuses on how one particular faculty member's workload increases when course seats are increased.

EPC has been working to craft content criteria that would require courses to adhere to a certain CS code. The Chancellor's Office argues that EPC does not have the authority to do so. EPC's current understanding is that faculty have the ability to assign CS code to a course, and then Deans and Administrators have the ability to decline to schedule that course if they don't agree to the CS code.

The Chancellor's Office is stating that EPC doesn't have authority to assign CS code.

K. Moranski shares that what she has been hearing from The Chancellor's Office is the process of establishing curriculum is a shared process: neither belongs in hands solely of faculty or solely of administrators. Curriculog clearly establishes a policy and practice of shared curricular development: when a course is established, faculty recommend a CS code, which is approved or discussed in the process of curricular approval. Administrators have the ability to question the assigned CS code, which could be realized as a stopping or non-approval of the course.

Question on why EPC can't establish a criteria for a particular set of courses regarding CS code. K. Moranski replies that establishing CS code criteria could limit the choices of fellow faculty members. EP&R was always intended as guidelines - the understanding that EP&R sets course maximums is not correct.

Response that criteria is inherently intended to limit choices for faculty. Establishes strong pedagogical guidelines based on the literature.

S. Severson suggests that EPC require CS codes knowing that administrators can work around the numbers. By establishing the criteria, they are creating hard guidelines on what makes a writing intensive course, and EPC's job is reviewing courses for pedagogical standards.

K. Moranski agrees that small class sizes are pedagogically appropriate for composition courses to allow for the process of writing (drafting, peer review, etc.). Industry recommendation (MLA) is 15. A lot of times, the small class sizes are not realized due to cost constraints.

Question on the process: if the CS code is not approved at the dean level, does the process start over?

K. Moranski states that is a good question. She thinks that currently, it does not, but it should route back through governance.

M. Milligan clarifies that this discussion has three points of conversation:

1. Can EPC specify a CS code in the content criteria?

2. CS code caps being exceeded in the scheduling process
3. Setting CS codes within curricular processes.

M. Milligan points out that course proposal forms in Curriculog ask for a “recommended CS code,” which implies that the curriculum can be changed after approval.

K. Moranski clarifies that CS codes can't be changed after a course has been mounted. She acknowledges that governance and Academic Programs may need to revisit the issue of how the CS code gets assigned and what that process looks like through Curriculog. Additionally, The Chancellor's Office maintains that CS codes can be changed by administrators-- CS codes have a relationship to class size, cost, and budget which is administrative purview.

Recommendation that drafted memo should be revised so that it clarifies 2 issues: shared governance in establishing CS codes and the mechanisms in place when concerns about creep start to arise. Reiterate the shared process of curricular decisions. Recommended that EPC members revisit and revise the document for review at our next meeting.

5. Credit Hour Policy (Information item from J. Lillig, Academic Programs) (see Google Drive 4/8)

Credit Hour Policy: required from WASC that we have a policy establishing credit hours and student work. Trying to get in place by summer. Brought to EPC for review because the policy states the EPC will ensure courses are adhering to policy through review of syllabi. The policy will go to Senate as an information item. No concerns voiced from EPC.

J. Lillig brings policy forward to Ex Comm, E. Asencio will comment on the impact for EPC.

6. Information dissemination (Discussion)

Request from some Deans to be cc'd on GE & EPC Agenda and Minutes so they can keep track of what is going on in the committees.

Agendas need to be publicly posted 48 hours before meetings. Currently they are not. At the moment, if someone wants access to the meetings agendas, they can contact Laurel.

Questions for consideration: When can minutes become public? Before or after approval at the next meeting?

Recommendation that the request be brought to S&F as consideration on how Agendas and Minutes can be made publicly available.

Minutes respectfully submitted by K. Springmier