

## **EPC Minutes - May 12, 2016**

**PRESENT:** Laura Watt (LW), Rich Whitkus (RW), Kathryn Chang (KC), Alvin Nguyen (AN), Kristen Daly (KD), Luisa Grossi (LG), Chiara Bacigalupa (CB), Melinda Milligan (MM), Tia Watts (TWs), Tim Wandling (TWg), Nathan Rank, (NR) Felicia Kalker (FK)

### **CHANGES TO THE AGENDA:**

- Delete new business items on the agenda; they were items from last meeting
- Move UNIV 102 from a consent item to a new business item.
- Add a 2nd discussion item: revision request for CCE “service learning” website content
- Renumbered discussion items 3,4,5 to 1,3,4

### **I. REPORTS**

Chair of EPC (LW)

- Regarding some items we’ve been discussed at EPC, including internship policy, the Sociology Department’s service learning policy, there is a resolution in the Senate today called “Faculty Authority Over Curricular Matters”. It will be available on the Senate webpage.
- Laura self-nominated (by acclamation) to be the Chair of EPC next year.
- LW will be on sabbatical. MM was nominated (by acclamation) to be a substitute Chair of EPC for fall 2016.

### **II. CONSENT ITEMS**

Approved various non-GE MCCCCF’s listed on Moodle, including

- SOCI 471, replacing a deleted course from catalog
- UNIV 239, course revisions

### **III. BUSINESS ITEMS**

**1. UNIV 102, make course repeatable for credit.** This item was pulled from consent items.

MM raised the question about what was being proposed with reference to the justification on the MCCCCF forms. AN mentioned the current ACE program created some issues by not allowing students retaking UNIV102. The committee also discussed maximum units allowed for the repeat and clarified the meaning of wording used for justification on the form. Members agreed (confirmed by RW) that any changes in the justification didn’t affect those in the catalog.

TWg moved to wave the first and second readings, KD second. Unanimously approved.

### **IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### **1. Formation of a new International Education Advisory Committee (IEAC)**

Hope Ortiz (HO) presented a draft proposal of a new IEAC. This proposal was presented at both ExComm and ACT. This proposal addresses the aspect of globalization of SSU’s strategic plan.

HO stated that SSU's international study program is much smaller compared to other CSU campus, primary due to lack of resources and funding. Because of faculty members are very involved with current programs such as international study abroad program, we would like to have faculty input and grow international study into a campus-wide program and bring it out of the extended education. The formation of IEAC would put the program into the senate and under the governance of our faculty, which in turn, makes the program more legitimate.

Members expressed enthusiasm and support for this proposal (NR, TWg, MM, LW). A couple of questions were raised and discussed such as report routing, meeting frequency, time of the meeting, and placement of IEAC (under APARC or EPC). MM suggested spending more time to map out the tasks of IEAC and reporting routing to clearly understand where the committee should be placed. HO will take EPC's suggestions to revise the proposal.

## **2. Request regarding CCE "Service Learning" website content (M. Miligan)**

MM asked EPC to consider a request to CCE that the website content be revised to reflect what was approved re "Definition and Guidelines for Service Learning Courses at Sonoma state University" by EPC and the Academic Senate in 2005.

There was a discussion about the background, specific wording ("shall" vs "must"), the function of the website, or website design to add a box or link to the approved definition. RW pointed out that the will of the Senate should be reflected on the website, which is under a direct control by the Senate. LW moved that she will craft a letter to Merith Weisman for clarification of CCE webpage language on service learning by adding the wording "as approved by the SSU Academic Senate in 2005." Unanimously approved.

## **3. Year-end Summaries from Subcommittees**

### **A. Heather Smith (HS) – Chair of GE Subcommittee**

- It is clear to me that many people have criticisms of our GE program. What's less clear to me is why? Possible reasons are 1) the structure of the program - we had opt out the pathway model back in 2003; 2) how it is framed (with people publically described disinterested faculty and students, comment about GE was purposely designed to prevent students from graduating); or 3) resources – we have this model where the departments used GE in a way to fund their smaller upper division majors. We need to find the source of problems before knowing how to move forward.
- We've amended, approved some courses (you'll see the list). We wrote policy memos (how to grade year-end courses). We brainstormed and discussed during the retreat about what's working or not working. We tried to reach out others to understand the history of GE.
- At this point, two things I thought would be interesting: 1) we talked about how we may bring coherence to the program by discussing some kind of path through it or advising track; 2) we need to get some data – one issue is that we need find somebody who is going to help us to write a program review before proposing any kind of changes. To do

that, it requires a lot of people's corporation. That would be the task we look at for the fall 2016.

Questions / comments:

NR: we've got support from the provost's office during last GE program review. Do you have that information about the support you have? Answer: the chair doesn't get a release. We could offer folks we'll reach out a course release or a stipend.

NR: At that time, 1) the Chair got 3-units release time; 2) at least 3 members got a stipend (\$5k) to help write a program review; 3) lunches was supported before the program review, when we were writing learning outcomes and faculty conversations. 4) a student assistant was hired (6-10 hrs/week for a semester) to gather all of syllabi across campus for GE courses; he analyzed the syllabi under the guidance of GE Chair for compliance with the course outline policy. 5) hiring an external reviewer.

There was a discussion about students' positive experiences in our GE program (TWg, CB, KD).

MM: Can you give us an update on whether there is a proposed revision to the GE course proposal form? We spent a lot of time talking about it and the form online was Spring 2014 version. Answer: It should be updated (one of my two accomplishments). I don't have access to that webpage... It was resolved.

HS raised the questions about who is responsible for the website. She cited some inconsistency about the information presented on the website and wondering who would be the one to fix that. FK offered some background info and mentioned GE Moodle page.

NR told a story about the experience of an external reviewer last time showcasing the positive side of GE program review...and hoped one of outcomes of GE program review is that the release time be restored.

TWg: acknowledging Alvin's role in working with peer mentors. The peer mentors and orientation leaders are so important to that (positive) messaging... also talked about ways peer mentors / faculty could re-brand GE courses to accomplish (LOs) pedagogically.

HS talked about a GE meeting discussion about a possible unit devoted to peer mentoring and wondered where to go with that -- EPC, the Arts and Humanity' individual instructors, or University Studies?

LW: the Arts and Humanity's curriculum committee?

KD: There is no Humanity's learning community faculty coordinator; not a lot of connection between peer mentors and faculty beside what they do on their own, I believe FYE has a coordinator and gets release time. We drafted a request asking if there could be units that would go to the humanity learning faculty coordinator.

GE Moodle page and content were discussed. LW and MM asked for an access to the page. MM raised a question about how best to permanently store information that is easily accessible to a wide range of people.

**B. Adam Zagelbaum (AZ) – Chair, Graduate Studies Subcommittee (GSS)**

- GSS facilitated the process by which we revamped a few programs' goals, such as the CANDEL program at School of Education, a nursing program at a Master's level. The expectation of ITDS program: the administrative power was shifted away from John (last name?) to GSS. We created a protocol and process by which GSS can use their resources and representation among faculty to the proposals and come up with advisers to future projects. We also reviewed proposals such as electronic thesis filing, thesis protocol – Library.
- GSS has a student rep. after 4-5 years of absence. A possible change in the meeting schedule may be needed to accommodate graduate students' class schedule. Committee members served as judges at the Student Research Showcase and Symposium. One of feedbacks is to have some recognition (ribbons) for graduate students who presented the research.
- Items for next year include typical scheduled program evaluations (e.g. English, Spanish, etc)
- Bulent Sokmen will replace Adam Zagelbaum to be the chair of GSS starting the fall of 2016.

Questions / comments:

MM: What happened this year with Graduate Studies and those two discontinuous proposals?  
Answer: they were initiated through this year. Nursing/ CANDEL had a discussion with GSS, basically informed us why they had to be moved into discontinuous. It was a mixed discussion. But in terms of charges of the committee and rationales provided, it didn't seem like GSS could oppose or stop that process to occur.

A discussion about when these two discontinued programs actually initiated, 14-15 or 15-16 (MM, LW, AZ, FK).

**4. EPC Tasks for WASC Review (R. Whitkus)**

LW suggested that interested members may come to a meeting after the Commencement to work on WASC review. NR will send out an email with doodle poll to schedule a date that would work for those who are interested.

Meeting adjourned at 12:55 pm  
Minutes submitted by Kathryn Chang