

## **Educational Policies Committee Meeting Minutes**

**September 12, 2019**

Present: Jenn Lillig (Chair), Christina Baker-Foley, Kathryn Chang, Sheri Schonleber, Kristen Daley, Emily Asencio, Melinda Milligan, Edie Brown, Melissa Kader, Karen Moranski, Katie Musick, Stephanie Toves (proxy), Owen Anfinson (proxy), Rita Premo (proxy)

Meeting called to order at 11:00am

Agenda approved with the following changes:

MCCCFs pulled from consent calendar

Letha Ch'ien should no longer be listed as an A&H rep for EPC

MCCCFs pulled for discussion: GEOL 323, THAR 333/334, WGS 455/390/385/335/325/301

Were the syllabi included with THAR proposals? KD notes that syllabi were sent with THAR proposal. KD will resend.

WGS 325: There was a question about service learning designation. But because that's not currently part of MCCCF requirements, WGS can't address that. JL moved this topic to horizon list.

WGS MCCCFs: MM explains that there was not an explanation for mode change on all MCCCFs and would be OK approving pending the addition of an explanation.

WGS 301: MM asked if there is any concern with changing WGS 301 from UD to LD. KMo said there is no issue. MM asked why class is listed as 1-4 units if it is always taught at 1-unit. KMo explained that they may want flexibility, which is a common reason for departments to do this. KMo suggests we ask for explanation.

MM moves to approve all pulled MCCCFs, pending the above fixes - other than WGS 301, for which we will await an explanation on units. EB seconds. Approved.

Minutes approved.

Discussion Item: Community engagement in GE- TC 11:15 (M. Weisman)

Community engagement was the one part of our strategic plan/core values not included in last year's GE revision. Part of the GE revision approval included the decision to follow-up with a discussion of how to add community engagement into GE.

Merith W: Although service learning is a pedagogy, community engagement is not a pedagogy. It's a core value, which may include, but is not limited to service learning. MW developed a memo that proposed various strategies that could be used to integrate community engagement into GE – developed with her counterparts at other CSUs, the director of California Campus Compact, and CCE faculty fellows. MW: Herself and faculty fellows are open to working with EPC on developing criteria for including community engagement in GE.

CBF: Can we see the document/s that have already been created with the recommendations for community engagement in GE?

MW shares document with JL. JL shares document with EPC (Google Drive). Faculty Fellows are listed on document - additionally, Jeffrey Reeder serves on committee, as well (though not a fellow).

EPC members will reach out to faculty fellow(s) from respective schools and chairs of school curriculum committees for feedback on document. JL will contact university studies. Members will report back to EPC in four weeks/two meetings from now to discuss responses to the question "Do any of these strategies seem like an appealing way for us as a campus to incorporate community engagement into GE?"

MW: Currently working to launch a new system called SSU Engage, which will track community engagement work of faculty and students. This is currently tracked, but it is all tracked manually and is imperfect. It will be formalized in the future. Will be added to horizon list.

New Business Item: 1st Reading- Minimal Adjustment ES (TC F. Farahmand, 11:30)

FF: Adding new courses to reflect changes in department. All elective courses, so will not change overall units in major.

MM notes there were issues with signature sheet and "hello sign."

SS: SLOs in syllabi are inconsistent. Some are clear and measureable and some are not.

JL: Comments for SLOs would be useful to add to curriculum guide. SS will forward to JL.

MM: Re side by side tables - We don't have side by side of complete major requirements. Would be helpful to add major requirements to side by side.

MM: Is the proposal to also remove courses from the catalog? FF: Current proposal is just to add courses.

KMo: Some courses may be eligible to be removed during catalog clean up because they have not been taught in years.

To do: Vic Liptak will contact FF to help with SLOs. Handout from school of ed for SLOs is forthcoming. Add side by side of major requirements including catalog copy and list of new elective courses. JL will schedule second reading in two weeks.

New Business Items: 1st Reading - Internship Policy (TC 11:45, J. Lillig, K. Moranski, M. Weisman)

JL – we have been in noncompliance for 8 years with chancellor's office. Because of this, we may not be protected with their insurance policy if we are sued.

Reworked from first time policy was presented based on initial feedback – includes new policy/process/documentation/forms.

MM: Requests that we slow down process so faculty have a chance to comment and approach this as a semester-long process.

EA: Points out that there are some concerns that were brought up the first time the policy came to EPC that do not seem to be addressed in the current documentation. Can we have a document that indicates which comments/concerns were addressed?

JL will start Google Doc for EPC where comments can be tracked. Committee can add comments in Google Doc. JL will add MW in order to see comments.

L Watt – Suggests having clear process for commenting on policy. How does EPC want to receive comments? JL would like feedback to come through EPC reps.

EA: What is the method for gathering comments from community outside of SSU? JL would like to know what kind of feedback we would be looking for. MW: Some community organizations have commented in the past, but most did not. From the community perspective it's about developing a contract with them. Contracts have gone smoothly from community side and CCE has yet to face concerns from community.

LW: Can we have info about questions that have been asked in which we were told "no" from risk management – so we know what we can't do vs what we have not yet asked about? MW: She will review notes from consulting firm - One question in which they were told "no" was "Can departments and faculty do this/create contracts themselves?" Departments that are already doing this can continue for up to two years.

JL: Suggests having process for adding comments to internship policy document in Google Drive. And another document where committee adds discussion questions. Will set aside time to discuss questions to frame discussion at EPC meetings – suggests 20-30 minutes per meeting. Asks that EPC members keep an eye on comments to see if something has been resolved.

MM asks for clarification on final process document. MW details how it describes the risk management process. More detailed than policy. Process form details all forms of community engagement work. Meant to help people understand their roles. Consulting company created document, but MW edited based on feedback. Document is not set in stone – there are some things we can change and some things we can't change.

JL: Policy Includes ways that departments can incorporate changes (see guidelines for departments' document)

Discussion Items: Feedback to S&F regarding GE overlay process and overall assessment reporting and School Curriculum Committees (and Univ Studies) in approval process TC 12:00

JL: GE does not want to take on overlays because of workload and would like to have separate group.

MM and LW as rep for S&F: S&F was charged with revising the structure of governance to deal with oversight of overlays and GE assessment and the role of the school curriculum committees. GE committee recommends having ad hoc overlay committee – as a subcommittee of EPC.

Workload would initially be high, but would decline over time, eventually eliminating the need for such a committee.

JL recommends a similar process be used for overlays as has been used for other content areas.

MM points out that the idea from GE committee is that members of ad hoc overlay committee would not need to be subject experts.

LW points out that the process of coming up with content criteria is separate from and approving courses. Also cautions that filling ad hoc committees comes with challenges. Filling the multiple (ad hoc) committees is getting harder and we're potentially diluting faculty involvement in these committees.

CBF: Suggests separate committees for each overlay. Important for experts and/or those with interest in specific overlays to be involved.

KMo: Three step process has generally happened with other GE areas— starts with draft of content criteria. Then requests feedback from campus (survey and forum). GE subcommittee then sorts through feedback and approves criteria. CB: How would we ensure that faculty who do have expertise in each overlay area have been involved in the approval process?

JL calls “time out” on discussion because the next time certain has arrived.

Old Business Item: 2nd Reading- Discontinuances, Minor and Certificate in Gerontology (TC K. Jaffe, 12:15)

JL sent out email to campus requesting feedback on discontinuance. KJ sent emails to community organizations and got one response.

KJ: Added updated info about student enrollment with names removed. Teach out plan indicates there is one student in program. Document now lists current courses that are age-related and other options for students – several other age-related programs are available elsewhere and notably are graduate programs. Emailed three community organizations - Council of Aging commented and expressed disappointment.

MM asked if appendices for program review were available. One part was titled “letters of support” and it may have useful info for senate, if available. When this goes to senate, the program review should go and should include appendices. KMo states that she can look for them and add if found. JL asks if letters would impact the decision about discontinuation.

MM: Can we keep comment period open through senate’s discussion? This has happened in the recent past.

JL points out that this would be inconsistent with what was done for physical science minor discontinuance. MM points out that the impact of the programs is different and we have the ability to treat them differently if we choose to and it's important to have a record that it is lack of resources not necessarily lack of interest that is driving this discontinuance.

CBF: Would be useful to have on the record that the reason for discontinuance is primarily lack of resources, if that's the case. KJ points to the decline in the number of students. MM specifies

that students were explicitly restricted from adding the program, which caused the decline. Emphasized that it is appropriate to indicate that the program has not had support, which impacted the program.

JL suggests indicating in the discontinuance that there is potential interest but discontinuance is recommended due to lack of support. MM agrees - saying there is no interest does not fully account for the process by which student enrollment has declined.

JL asks if the committee is ready to recommend discontinuance and if so what should the message be? JL is OK to send out a draft of that message to committee.

EB recommends being consistent and keeping comment period closed. As an advisor has not come across students expressing interest in gerontology.

KD moves to recommend discontinuing minor and certificate. Second.

MM points out that we need to come to a consensus about exactly how we are expressing why we are making this recommendation to discontinue.

CBF moves to add amendment – the recommendation is due to lack of resources, but not a lack of interest. Second.

SS recommends calling the question on the amendment. Passes.

Amendment fails.

EB recommends calling question. Passes (2 vote against)

JL asks for members to raise hands if in favor of language for discontinuance to include that there is some level of student interest. Then asks if any members are against adding this information. JL offers to include that in the past there was some interest in the program and over the years that interest has declined - that decline may be due to a number of reasons. We have one piece of information from the community, no evidence of current student interest and no courses are available.

MM points out that program review has to go forward to senate along with the recommendation to discontinue and that is the evidence of the students' interest. JL confirms that the review will go forward with the recommendation to discontinue.

Old Business Items: 2nd Reading- Curriculum Revision Minor Adjustment- EMBA (TC S. Haylett, 12:30)

Proposal to swap out 559E for 547E. Deleting 559E from catalog. CBF moves to approve. Second. Passes.

Meeting adjourns.