

EPC Minutes – March 12, 2020

PRESENT: Jenn Lillig (JL), Christina Baker-Foley (CB), Kathryn Chang (KC), Kristen Daley (KD) Sheri Schonleber (SS), Matty Mookerjee (MMo), Emily Asencio (EA), Luisa Grossi (LG), Katilin Springmier (KS), Melinda Milligan (MM), Katie Musick (KM), Stacey Bosick (SB), Marith Weisman (MW)

ABSENT: Emily Twisselmann (ET), Edie Brown (EB)

Approved agenda with changes

Approved 2/27/20 Minutes

I. REPORTS - JL

- GE implementation. It was originally scheduled to offer sustainability and global awareness classes in Spring 2021. We'll stay on the implementation schedule, but we cannot get these approved until Fall 2021 (catalog).
- WIC courses. We've got a list of WIC courses and will sent out electronically for virtual approval. This would be the last time we do this because GEAR is planning to do this through the Overlay Subcommittee, as other overlay courses.

II. CONSENT ITEMS – approved

III. OLD BUSINESS ITEMS

1. 2nd reading-Internship Policy

The discussion was centered on 45 hours per unit paragraph in the policy statement and how can we make it clearer based on CS code 36. Questions were raised about how is this CS code translated to our students work outside of the classroom? (KS), does students need to have additional hours (on top of 45 hours) to do department reflection process and integration activities stated in the last sentence? (MM), can department add extra work for students? (KD)

Extensive discussion on hours – hours on site, hours with the faculty and hours on assignments. The Carnegie rule (2 or more hours of outside work required for each hour spent in the classroom) was mentioned (MMo). This rule may not apply to some CS codes. Some of CS codes do not have assignment hours outside of the class (KD). It would be challenging to the sites if we have hours less than 45 hours and we need to increase the sites; any hours less than 45 hours per credit would have reduced the sites (MW). The committee also looked at other CSU campuses (Chico / Northridge) for their internship policy related to the discussion. As to “one hour per week with the faculty”, the concern for restricting department flexibility or possible changes to the department

current internship structure as result of this policy was raised because some internships are out of the country (EA).

Changes to the paragraph were discussed based on above discussion. See the draft for details. For next time, we should make decisions on this as well as on 12 units of internship being applied toward the bachelor's degree (JL).

IV. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

1. 1st reading: Spanish and French Curricular changes (J. Reeder (JR), TC 11:40)

JR: An increasing number of students (especially true to Spanish program) who have entered the programs at upper division level have Spanish /or French as their home language – bilingual students. A popular career option for our students after completing the degree is education. We feel that it is essential that students who graduated from a language program had the experiences of learning a language in a classroom setting. For that reason, we've submitted a request for requiring all students who major in Spanish / or French take at least one class in another language. We have not restricted this to SSU classes. It is fine if students want to do this at a local community college or over the summer. We've not restricted this to only spoken languages. We recognize ASL is a language and it counts. Many of the requirements in the language degree plan also count for GE, students still have many electives left.

DISCUSSION:

Question was raised about this requirement may impose barriers to students with disability (SS). The department has worked with DSS for students with disability and offer the accommodations they need (JR). From personal experience, it would be a huge benefit for students learning another language, like Spanish major to take French (MMo).

About 40-45% students are double majored. One dissenting vote at the department level was due to the concern of overload due to double major (JR), and it will be a business item (JL). About national trending of COPLAC institutions (KS), the additional language requirement is upward trending. All California public institutions require another language and SSU is an outlier (JR). Do we need a list of courses at SSU or other universities (KS)? and it will be overwhelming to list all courses (CB). A discussion on what kind of languages count towards additional language requirement. In general, structural languages are considered (JR), and computer languages (MM) are not accepted, as a natural language.

For 2nd reading, the committee asks for national data, specifically data from COPLC institutions.

2. 1st reading: GEOL 302

KS: this course was reviewed at the same time as another GEOL course (303?) we looked at EPC. Conversations about setting the precedent was not part of this conversation. I added materials as we are reviewing in the curriculog and the Memo just provides add'l details.

MMo: I think some of notes are helpful, but it didn't capture what is the most probable reason for the one "nay" vote, which is, Geography teaches a similar course on climate changes... It had very little to do with the GEness, but the territory. Related to climate changes, I have problems with people trying to limit the conversation on the climate change, limit the distribution of facts about the climate change with regards to their own self-interests when it is clearly goes against what's the community needs. The community needs more UD B (courses)... This course was approved as a GE course 2 years ago; it is obviously a GE course.

SB: With respect to similar classes in other departments, are the classes so similar that they should be cross listed with each other or are they distinct enough that students can take both classes and gain additional knowledge from having taken both?

MMo: I think they could gain by taking both; I think the politics behind trying to cross listed them between two schools would be probably insurmountable, even if the content wasn't... I think we do have somewhat different perspectives than Geographers on this issue.... (Opening a conversation on having a) climate change concentration, students could take multiple climate change related courses...

SB: In the interest of students on campus, students will be allowed to take both courses. That's not problematic, correct?

MMo: No, I don't think so.

MM: I asked the GE rep Jeff B. from Social Sciences for insights. A lot of what I've heard was not an issue of territoriality. There are lots of climate changes courses on the campus, whether or not they are called that. In fact, Sociology will propose a climate change course next year. I think what Matty was saying that all of the people teaching courses called climate change getting together and thinking about differentiating the courses and having them related to each other and amplifying that conversation is an really key thing that should be happening on campus. I hope that continues next year and we can do that in a more formal fashion. It would be interesting to figure out how to differentiate them if that is reasonable. From EPC, does the course reflect what we think of as a UD GE course in terms of the content? From social sciences perspective, I would like to have EPC think about generally whether climate change is a LD or UD course?

JL: that would be in reference to this particular part of upper division B document.

MM: the questions that were raised to me were around "is the readings sufficiently rigorous? Is there enough of it? Do the assignments actually map on to what we think of as being appropriate for an upper division vs. lower division GE content?"

JL: So maybe the question is: "is there any reasons that we think it is not?"

MMo: yes, absolutely... we got rid of the pre-requisites to make it GE. We thought it as UD GE because it has pre-requisites. The course content does not change much so it is a UD GE.

JL: We have the course proposal and GE document before us. If you are not convinced by the document and need to see more... is there more materials that we need Matty to bring back for the 2nd reading?

MM: the course syllabus mirrors the languages that we usually see in the Area E. I just wanted to confirm that is what department wanted and intended? It mirrors the language of now updated sociological and physiological processes.

MMo: The topic is just across so many boundaries, we definitely want to focus primary on the science of climate change. If you are not thinking about the psychological and emotional impact of climate change during that conversation, then you are not doing a justice. We feel like we need to do both. There is a lot of discussion about media and how do you digest things from various sources. That's not strictly natural sciences but it is very import to the class and this topic must be discussed and processed in this class... Because we focus mainly on the scientific data for climate change, that's why it is more of B course.

JL: sounds like you're talking about integrated aspects of upper division? Yes (MMo). For 2nd reading: Matty is not bringing anything back, everyone needs to look at the comments from GE Subcomm, and document submitted and what curricular requirements are.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. EPC statement on remote teaching

JL: Whether EPC needs to issue a policy about suspending the rule from modality changes – part of faculty governance process. Looking at what online teaching is and what modality changes are, thinking about the best way to support faculty, I landed on EPC statement about what remote teaching is and how we are looking at faculty governance for curricular approval. We don't have to change modality, even if we shift to the distance learning option after the Spring break; we're not in violation of WASC's guideline (that 50% to be f2f teaching). We do want to point out that, during this process, faculty aren't necessary to switch to online education (which has its own pedagogy).

- Short description of the statement by paragraphs

KS: I didn't change the content but break the sentences – 1st paragraph

MM: It was great by shifting the policy to statements and it was exactly on target, thumps up!

JL: I'll take it to the senate this afternoon and present it as part of my report. Then we would send it out to the faculty.

MM: Laura is working on a general statement about senate business moving online.

SB: AP is working with IT so information (related to coronavirus) from different offices will be in one home.

2. Request to GE Subcommittee (*GE hereafter*)

JL: I went to *GE* meeting last week and talked about focusing on the content area (as LG suggested at last EPC meeting). I also talked about academic freedom and how people's syllabi can change so asking folks for specifics on class by class basis and what content they are covering is a little bit overkill, the signature assignments could change as well.

KS: we had a very productive conversation on what's *GE* role was in this new *GE* implementation. We came to an understanding that we should be focusing more on the content criteria than general education learning outcomes because GELO is part of the assessment plan. Afterwards, we did look at some courses, and the process was much more smother. The big question that *GE* still has, and would like EPC to think about, is for unique circumstances – courses requested for pre-requisites, or additional unit. They want to some clear guidelines on either things to ask for or red flags for courses. LG: agreed.

JL: *GE* is okay with just focusing on the content criteria, but was asking for direction specifically about pre-requisites and special circumstances... I think they should use the curricular piece on these circumstances.

SB: AP will look at the policy side of it.

JL: We could send them an email and asking *GE* to focusing on the content criteria, we understand your concerns about GELOs and encourage to follow the curriculum and use your best judgement.

KS: There was another suggestion on the committee to start a working document of guidelines for reviewing courses with unique and special circumstances.

SB: I think it would be useful of tracking these precedent setting issues that Melinda was brought up, such as 4 units exception, the pre-requisite exception, etc. One of most important pieces is that faculty feel like their classes weren't being evaluated equally. If the committee keeps tracking of their precedent setting decisions so it is clear and would have supported these guidelines when later proposals are coming through. And AP can help guide faculty as they're putting programs through but still deferred to the faculty and *GE* as to what decisions they've made in the past.

JL: it would be nice to record the rationales for any exceptions they've made in a google doc and include these in the Curriculog comment from *GE* for tracking exceptions.

MM: ...I do think the decisions they make are set precedents; they are building guideline as they are making decisions. Also, how EPC looks at courses that come up from *GE*.

Even though *GE* review a course in terms of GEness, EPC is reviewing a course generally. So, some of things that *GE* might have said it is not in its purview, it is still okay to bring them at EPC.

JL: I'll send a memo with above comments

3. Forum 4/15? GWAR, CRS or AI Content Criteria

JL: We had talked about moving the process along for Critical Race Studies and GWAR, there is a request for both overlays to get moving. The Overlay Subcomm is being

elected. But EPC could proceed forward to start holding some of initial open forums, starting discussion about the content areas and getting feedbacks from the constituents on campus. I am looking at 4/15, 1-3pm one overlay discussion and 3-5pm for the other one. And we will model off what *GE* is doing, trying to get some working languages to start with, for example, we have what the Chancellor office's requirement is for meeting GVAR requirements, we could look at current ethnic studies requirements see how those match up with the new critical race studies curriculum and looking at what they do on other campuses and using that as a framework to provide discussion and feedback from campus proceeding forward.

CB: there are criteria that we've discussed for critical race studies are little bit different from those for ethnic studies. Just wanted to let everyone know that we do have that before this. Is EPC going to review courses for that area starting this semester?

JL: No. the process is similar to *GE*... in this case we just get the ball rolling on the opening part ... and turn it over to the Overlay Subcomm to actually finish developing the content area criteria at the beginning of the Fall semester, so we could get it done sooner in the Fall.

Scheduling the forum via doodle pool, along with multiple modalities (including virtual forum), was discussed.

Meeting adjourned at 12:50 pm

Minutes submitted by Kathryn Chang