

EPC Minutes – March 18, 2021

PRESENT: Emily Asencio (EA), Mike Ezra (ME), Kathryn Chang (KC), Kristen Daley (KD)
Sheri Schonleber (SS), Matty Mookerjee (MMo), Katilin Springmier (KS), Melinda Milligan (MM),
Mary Ellen Wilkosz (MEW), Luisa Grossi (LG), Joseph Lofton (JoL)
Katie Musick (KMu), Stacey Bosick (SB), Jenn Lillig (JL), Damien Hensen, Jenny Bent

Approved 2/18/21 & 3/4/21 Minutes

Approved agenda

CONSENT ITEMS – Approved

- With additional courses: BIO308, CHEM301, GEP110, GLBL110, SOC375, SSCI220, & NURS370

REPORTS

1. AVP, Academic Programs – SB

- A new program - Early Childhood Education, that is entirely online, master program – that sets off a whole stream paperwork with WASC.
- TIGO grant – collaborative grant w other CSU – we are able to distribute funds to programs that wanted to do revision for student success, especially around anti-racist curriculum. We have an anti-racist faculty fellow, a specialist in curriculum and fantastic to work with. The application is due 5/7.
- AP/AF offices - how do we have faculty come back to campus? They would accommodate faculty who wanted to come back. I've asked the dean to put together tiers of faculty: on-campus and teaching class in person, on campus and doing labs and research or zoom class, teaching remotely. We need to be able to track how many people will be on campus and can notify in case of an outbreak.
- It would be really beneficial to include a syllabus statement in the fall, get students expectation about attendance, requirement of wearing mask in class. Just wondering if I could work this with this group – just a recommended text for faculty to use for their syllabus.

MMo: at the chairs meeting – that was the request of me to bring it for EPC to come up with the language – emphasizing the faculty authority to ask students who don't wear mask to leave or call security to remove them from the class. What constitute disruptive behaviors in this Covid-environment?

EA: how do students feel about this idea that faculty enforce mask-waring in class, joe?

JL: we are currently working on gathering the data about student's preference. I have meetings line up during the last week of March. Will share the data back by the first week of April.

SB will work out the language draft and the committee will discuss it in our next meeting.

BUSINESS ITEMS

1. BA Thar Concentration TC 11:20 (Scott Horstein) – 2nd reading

SH: We made it clear that the academic and faculty driven reasons behind the CS code adjustments. In the core curriculum, Thar 379 moved from 3 units to 4 units as shown in the side-by-side document. Dance side did their own revision. Dance 110 (no longer exist) – substituted by dance 115 (1 unit). Also addressed the EPC question on how students were not first time first year students entering the major would fulfill the learning community requirement.

There are two reasons for this revision: 1) compliance to EO 1070 (requires that at least 50% of courses in the major); 2) pursuing the accreditation from National Association of schools of Theaters, which requires all students taking units for shows they are working on.

MMo moved to approve the 2nd reading; KS seconded. Unanimously approved.

2. AI Discussion TC 10:45

MM: referring to JB's email – a group of chairs in School of Social Sciences concerned about the AI courses, specifically US history and government courses – it is important for students to have exposure to other social science perspectives (as part of liberal arts education) beyond these two specifically defined courses. There will be add'l discussion in the curriculum committee today about possible ways to move forward a recommendation around this issue – will come back (to EPC) in a form of proposal.

EA: maybe this item would be for our next meeting

3. Fall 21 WIC Course list approval TC 10:05

EA: This list was previously approved courses

SB: These courses were from LARC and shopped around to the Deans. Deans worked with the programs and determined what WIC courses they could support. In prior years, it was approved based on the instructors. I don't know how EPC wants to handle it this year because you have courses with new instructors who haven't had trainings with LARC.

MM: that is fine given with current circumstances. It would be useful if LARC reaches out to these new instructors and make sure they know where to get support if they have any questions.

MM moved the list as it was presented to us for Fall 2021; KS seconded

Discussion

What EPC wants to do, if any courses added later than this list, instructors change or schedule change – any minor changes before registration happens?

EA: we are not making changes after the registration is open

MM: do we want new addition of a course coming back to EPC?

SB: you approve these courses based on they are WIC courses before.

MM: The spreadsheet does not have class size – we could ask AP for the class size for these courses going forward.

SB showed the class size – the courses are recommended at a cap of 25, only one class is greater than 30

MM amended the motion: EPC approves these courses with the understanding the expected cap is 25; MMo seconded; unanimously approved

4. WIC Discussion TC 11:00 (Scott Severson)

EA: Enrollment cap is kept at 25. All documents are in the Feb 4 folder. Using CS code to keep the cap size.

SB: the CS code in course cap cannot be written into the curriculum as you are proposing. It is the bargaining issue with the union, so it circumvents the bargaining process if you would write it into the curriculum. Because it has to do with the workload, faculty can absolutely recommend the course cap according to the pedagogy. But because it has to do with the workload, room capacity and other administrative issues, the ability to flex and keep university running and allowing faculty the freedom to teach (subjects) differently. The CS code can be recommended but not something you could write straight into the curriculum.

SS: Can the requirements for lab courses required that courses be the CS code that is a lab?

SB: yes, because a lab course is fundamentally different.

SS: we have had CS code are part of the curriculum. I cannot imagine that doesn't exist in lab classes. My prior understanding felt that we had a place where there was this flexibility in the sense that CS code are often not used to cap classes at specific numbers. I've heard the process by which the faculty could put in as part of the curriculum – we have a CS code as a set of tools for us to say that. We're adjudicating now what WIC means, I'm surprised the earlier understand of CS code could be overwritten by the administrators, then what are our CS code for?

SB: CS code coming to the labs have to do with the activities of the course. The course cap is really a workload issue.

MMo: I would suggest in the case of WIC, this is very similar to labs with inherently activities being accomplished - falls into the same category as the lab courses.

EA: that was my understanding that the way faculty control the course capacity and structure is through the CS code. I am not sure how do we do that if we don't use the CS code?

SB: faculty don't control the class size; they only recommend caps on courses for pedagogical reason. Ultimately, it is a workload issue with the union.

SS: Perhaps looking at body of work, how students gaining their writing competency through activities – interactions between students and faculty. These are writing intensive course and would be structured as lab courses. Which of the CS codes that allows engagement in student prepared work and the feedback of that work? The workload and class sizes can be expanded and contracted on things that are purely in the faculty domain...It is too early to give up CS code and may need a broader discussion.

NS: is it possible to reconceptualize the WIC course that contains the writing lab course?

MM: Scott said that the faculty construct and approve the curriculum, including the appropriate size of the course as it links to the pedagogy. But the administrator could approve or not approve those courses in the schedule. I need a better understanding about CS code being a bargaining issue. How CFA takes on that issue?

KD: talking to CFA to get an understanding on that

SB: what is the issue you are trying to solve? It's been recommended for a few years. What is the concern here? It looks like the Deans have been respected to the class size (of 25).

EA: in our department, we have the enrollment cap raised after the registration started this semester. The class size was increased by 5 without consultation with the instructor. We're establishing these WIC criteria, and it is the time to build in the cap, so everyone understands that this is the recommendation and will be respected.

EA: will bring back SS and Continue this discussion after the spring break.

5. Modification of course capacities and modes of instruction TC 11:30

EA: the course capacity memo is in the google drive. We can talk about this in our next week. EPC has the purview to step in as this reflects on the curriculum.

6. EPC Committee for Area F/ES/CRS TC 10:15

A proposal for GE/overlay revision group (GEORG) curriculum – document in google drive

MM: EPC form a working group to consider potential revisions to current GE/Overlay curriculum that was passed in 2019. The group will take the report back for EPC to review, vote on, and forward to the senate. The goal would be to allow EPC to bring a revision of the curriculum to the senate in the early fall 2021 (be effect in 2022, 2023), should there be any changes that EPC wants to endorse and bring forward. The membership of the group would be anyone from EPC, overlay/GE comm chairs or their designees.

JL: would EPC student rep be eligible to sit on the work group? - Yes.

JL moved to form GE/Overlay Revision EPC working group; MMo seconded; unanimously approved

7. Memo from ES Faculty regarding recommendation for Area F TC 10:30

EA: memo from ES faculty and the course list in google drive

SB: 10 courses are all lower division courses that provide students who need in Area F in order to graduate in 2024/2025. LD courses that do not need to be cross listed.

JL: we looked at the enrollment in these 10 courses over the course year. For example, the regular offering of these courses we had this year matched up with the projection that we need to serve 20% of incoming class, which would put us on track for those students to complete their Area F requirement by mid junior year, to get us to compliant with the law.

SB: we hope to get the tag for NAMS165 for this summer to get new students for a chance to accumulate 6 units.

MM: for non-ethnic studies courses, have those chairs kept in loop?

SB: yes, we hadn't had any concerns from chairs for (these courses) being temp tagged

KS: When the learning community switches, it is losing A3 components of GEness. We have very few stand-alone A3 courses. Is it another point of concern where SSU has to think about how to institute more A3 courses?

JL: I had an email out to AMCS and CALS departments but haven't heard anything back. SB will follow-up.

KD moved to approve the temp tag list; ME seconded

Discussion

JL: 10 courses are ES prefix for incoming freshman those courses could fulfilled Area F and overlay. For everyone else, they would maintain their tag.

SB: I'm hearing a need to loop back to the programs and make sure they want to count it as F tag even for the first-year freshman. I'm pretty sure we've done that but wanted to double-check. In the case FLC, they've got 2 GE areas so if they move to F, they have to drop off one of these GE areas, most are in A3 area. To check with the programs to see which of the two previous tag they want to drop in favor of this.

KD amended the motion to approve the temp tag with 10 courses in green for 2 years (AMCS225, AMCS260, AMCS165B, CALS219, CALS220, CALS165B, NAMS165, NAMS200, & NAMS205); KS seconded; unanimously approved

Meeting adjourned at 11:50 AM

Minutes submitted by Kathryn Chang