

**Educational Policies Committee  
February, 18, 2021  
Meeting Minutes**

**Present:** Emily Asencio (EA), Mike Ezra (ME), Kathryn Chang (KC), Kristen Daley (KD) Sheri Schonleber (SS), Matty Mookerjee (MMo), Kaitlin Springmier (KS), Melinda Milligan (MM), Mary Ellen Wilkosz (MEW), Luisa Grossi (LG), Joseph Lofton (JL),

Katie Music (Kumu), Stacey Bosick (SB), Jenn Lillig (JL), Damien Hansen,

**Approval of minutes and agenda**

Modified agenda and minutes approved at 10:03

**Philosophy BA – Josh Glasgow- First Reading Waived; Unanimously Approved**

- a. When GE classes went through the unit requirements and now need to change course units to match new GE requirements
- b. Melinda asked if it was an issue that he could not major classes because they are GE classes – and if there is a side-by-side. Side-by-side was shared by Emily
- c. Core classes have stayed the same except they went from 4 to 3 credits. Two units shorter now than in old program
- d. Josh responded- lowered # of units required for the major and yes, it is a big problem not to be able to hold classes for the majors. It is a major administrative problem.
- e. First Reading Waived; Second Reading - **Unanimously approved**

**2. Area F issue**

- a. GE is not comfortable moving forward with moving forward with content area at this point.
- b. Joe Lofton. What is the timeline for implementation?
- c. Stacey-Legally obligated to implement in fall, 2021
- d. Melinda-Interesting that the memo is in solidarity with CSU and GE is recommending not to move forward with content criteria until larger issues is resolved. There are two
  - i. Content criteria issue
  - ii. Opening up and revising GE criteria for curriculum
  - iii. Sense that the campus as a whole doesn't know where Area F stands
  - iv. People are confused campus-wide about the options and where things stand
- e. Stacey-Required by educational code.

- i. Allows chancellor's office to implement this requirement as they wish, and the chancellor chose to implement an "Area F" option in spite of the cut to area D. This cut is recognized but the law is that we need to create an area F option.
- ii. We are one of only 3 campus that has not moved forward; we are the only campus that has not proposed an alternative and is not doing anything.
- iii. Worth thinking about how faculty can move this forward.
- iv. Stacey's office has put out GE Projections so unnecessary classes are not mounted – as if F would go forward and there would be that reduction to Area D.
- v. Without any new classes approved, have received blessing to "temp tag" the ethnic studies courses as meeting area F.
- vi. The main issues on the faculty side from faculty who want a new course or new ethnic studies course but there is no mechanism.
- vii. The second thing is the catalog changes and this needs to be accurately represented by the deadline of March for the fall 2021 inclusion.

f. Melinda

- i. Current classes would shift over to area F. That was the previous implementation plan
- ii. GE classes are backlogged and there was no way to get these classes reviewed in time. CRT would go to overlay committee but it did not
- iii. Social Studies is waiting to hear from academic programs about what does this look like. From a funding perspective and what happens to FTs.
- iv. We need to know what is feasible re implementation and how area F might fit into the implementation. Before SS can move forward, this needs to be taken care. What are the possible ways that implementation would be allowed from Stacey – representing Academic Programs.

g. Stacey

- i. GE needs to handle this as it is a GE problem
- ii. The majority of the FTEs need to go to Ethnic Studies
- iii. Initial suggestion was to say 75% of cross-listed classes go to Ethnic Studies but a bad idea.
- iv. The better way might be in GE allocations. 75% of area F need to be offered by Ethnic Studies and 25% from other departments and cross-listed with both Ethnic Studies and other departments. That way the FTE flows back to the department.

- h. Melinda
  - i. Nothing done at the macro-level for strategies to propose alternatives
  - ii. Jenn suggested the consensus of Xcom at the time was to not allow academic programs to make the change. It needs to go through formal changes. Jenn would cross off the critical part original doc. Just trying to help things along or suggested language. Helps to get the conversation moving.
  - iii. Melinda was saying that EPC needs to revise the curriculum and an EPC working group could work with academic programs to come up with a proposal to bring back to EPC.
  - iv. Some of it is very straightforward. Add 3 units of F and subtract 3 units of D.
- i. Kaitlyn suggests taking this area F issue out of GE's plate in general and have EPC assign to someone else.
- j. Stacey
- k. Melinda suggests that EPC form an ad hoc working group to move this forward rather than having the GE committee

### **3. Spanish Major Changes First Reading**

- a. Parissa Tadrissi spoke on behalf of the MA Changes
  - i. Passed at senate in the spring
  - ii. Reducing elective credits from 6-2
  - iii. Brings MA to 30 units from 34
- b. Kaitlin noted that the wrong materials had been uploaded to the EPC Drive
- c. Review was completed in April; there was a Curriculog update so that may be what happened.
- d. Parissa screen-shared correct information. Showed where required units would go from 34 to 30 and the electives would go from 6 to 2.
- e. Emily
  - i. We need to have the correct version of the document in order to move it forward. Emily doesn't know who uploaded the incorrect document.
- f. Melinda
  - i. What was the conversation at GSS- At grad studies (from Mary Ellen Wilkosz) they saw the proposal for the grad level change and it is out there Chat sent by Katie Musick who took minutes from the GSS meeting and affirmed that the correct documents were there at the meeting
- g. Maddy question re 2 unit electives

- i. Answer from Parissa – Can take a two or 4 unit course at another institution
- h. Parissa stated that the MA program review is in process.
- i. Emily – we are at a hold because we need to get the documents before making a decision.
- j. Melinda suggests that we take a pause and try to locate documents. Will need the documents for the second reading. Emily suggests that we schedule the second reading for two weeks from today. Parissa will try to track it down. March 4th will be the second reading

#### **4. WIC forms**

- a. Melinda shared her current proposed revisions to the Overlay Content Criteria for WIC classes
  - i. Substantive changes include 25 seat cap and confirmation that course sequences match stretch classes.
- b. Scott thanked Melinda for her contribution and stated:
  - i. The idea of parsing language to include opportunities...a good change and what the committee was trying to change
  - ii. On question of GE paperwork, committee wanted to make sure faculty knew that when engaging with overlay, there are other procedures that need to be handled.
- c. Melinda asked if the language could be revised to reflect the fact that there are other considerations but not to have to attach the GE paperwork with the submission. This related to Curriculum requirements.
- d. Scott suggested that Boilerplate language might say something like “this proposal **may or may not** require additional documents for approval.
- e. Mary Ellen noted that two of the nursing major WIC classes are NOT GE so those requirements don’t apply
- f. Kristen reported that the consensus is that the 25 person cap is important. She asked several other committees about this
- g. Emily..what happens if cap is increased to 30 after the WIC class has been mounted. Melinda...it was the practice that it was a hard cap but not sure how feasible that is. Maybe the CS code is the way for departments to adhere. There are CS caps that are lower. So departments could put the WIC class through a CS cap that is even lower than 25. The suggestion is the WIC criteria for 25 student cap go through CS Code.
- h. Scott stated that there would be mechanisms for a WIC class to be included in the transcript and the only mechanism for class size is CS. The selection of appropriate CS codes should be prescribed.

- i. Melinda means to add to the content criteria form has the course being proposed needs to have the WIC prefix included. They are all new courses first and would have the WIC prefix.
  - j. Emily...address the issues brought up by Melinda.
  - k. Stacey..in terms of timing for fall implementing, not sure there is going to be enough time for movement through the committees. Perhaps academic programs with a list of previously approved WIC courses so there are courses on the books. Melinda suggested a temp tag for moving forward. Stacey agreed. Deeply concerned about no WIC courses for the fall. Melinda agreed that it is too late for any review process at overlay. Emily said that it had already been agreed that the old system was going to be in place. LARC will provide Emily with a list and she will follow up. Stacey said that LARC thinks the overlay committee is in charge. No objections to Stacey's suggestions for moving things forward.
5. **Napoleon Reyes Criminal Justice Program.** Emily recused herself and asked Melinda to preside over the meeting because the issue involves her.
- a. Copy of memo sent to School of Social Sciences curriculum Committee
  - b. Draft of memo from EPC
  - c. Napoleon addressed EPC
    - i. Procedures must be followed every time a class is changed. There are multiple processes and procedures must be followed.
    - ii. The internship class was unilaterally changed by the Dean without following procedures or consultation from the faculty.
    - iii. Her primary reason for doing this was to circumvent class size cap. She wanted to take away resources and add more students. Faculty refused and the dean pushed back. On Feb 25<sup>th</sup>, dean removed internship coordinator and changed CS code and appointed herself as class instructor. Dean Carlton is not a CCCSJ faculty and she does not have the qualifications to teach this class. She removed the internship coordinator. This in spite of the dean calling the department the "crown jewel" of the school.
    - iv. The concern is the diminishment of the value of the program and ending procedures put in place over 20 years to ensure quality.
  - d. Melinda –
    - i. 4 units normally at a cap of 36 and the new CS code has a cap of 78. There are now two courses and one is taught by the dean and one is being taught by Emily.
    - ii. The dean set the enrollment capped at 35 and a cap of 12 is required for that model.
  - e. Joe –
    - i. What is the solution or outcome to have justice

- f. Napoleon
  - i. The faculty only want the resources to do the job correctly.
  - ii. The issues is there are more students for one internship class.  
Dean refused to add the resources and came up with the solution above
- g. Melinda asked about role of internship coordinator and consequences of removing the coordinator and the dean inserting herself as the internship coordinator.
  - i. The internship coordinators carry over the load but that is not officially reflected in work load of the coordinator. The coordinator also makes diary entries of her evaluations of interns. The department developed a policy that is being used now by the police department
- h. Mattie
  - i. This is incredibly egregious. We will support the department in any way we can.
  - ii. Is CFA involved? They need to be involved. This affects everyone. Deans cannot do this. Labor issue significant. How is that OK at all?
- i. Napoleon
  - i. First grievance filed last fall
  - ii. Emily was removed as an act of retaliation and CCJ filed a grievance against the university.
- j. Melinda-Let's look at the proposed memo from EPC
- k. Check CS code first to make sure the code has actually been changed.  
But issue is the intent to change the code.
- l. Could in memo about the role of EPC. The faculty codes are part of shared governance vs curriculum purview. There is a difference in understanding about what that means. The chancellor's office took issue with our internship policy.
- m. Melinda suggested extending to noon. No objections noted.
- n. Asked for language for suggested changes
- o. Suggested changes noted and made.
- p. Motion to approve memo seconded and approved with no discussion
- q. Unanimous approval

**6. Meeting ended at 12:01**

