

Educational Policies Subcommittee Minutes, December 10, 2019 - PARTIAL

Present: Jenn Lillig (Chair), Jeffrey Reeder (for Christina Baker-Foley), Kathryn Chang, Sheri Schonleber, Kristen Daley, Matt James (for Matty Mookerjee), Emily Asencio, Kaitlin Springmier, Melinda Milligan, Luisa Grossi, Karen Moranski, Stacey Bosick

Absent: Edie Brown, Melissa Kadar

New Business Item:

1st reading: GEOL 303 (GE UD B)

Lillig reported that GEOL 303 was recommended for approval by a 7-1 vote by the GE Subcommittee; as the decision was not unanimous, the proposal is a business item for EPC. It is an existing course that is applying to be certified within the new GE program. There was no memo from GE summarizing their discussion, but it was reported that the GE members had concerns that the assigned reading was too much and too difficult and that the course was not sufficiently interdisciplinary. Milligan expressed general concern that it was difficult to make a decision without having more information on GE's review of the proposal, especially in relation to why they the exceptions to GE policy were warranted (unit value and prereqs).

Milligan noted that the GEP and ANTH Departments relayed concern that they had not been contacted to be asked if their courses could be listed as prerequisites. James said as it was an existing course such outreach was not done.

Questions included:

- The prerequisites listed in the proposal were unclear/confusing.
- Was there a unique circumstances document that justified why the proposal deviated from GE policy included in the proposal and discussed by GE? James said the document was included.
- The course is proposed at 4 units, rather than the 3 units required for UD GE courses. What is the justification? What is the GE process for tracking these exceptions, as well as the Academic Programs process for managing the offering of 4 unit GE courses, and what factors did GE take into account in making the exception?
- The course lists prerequisites beyond the Golden 4, which is an exception to GE policy. What is the justification?
- Why is there a need for a lab at the upper division level, since the requirement is met at the lower division level?
- The proposal acknowledges the course has a high failure rate for the general (non GEOL) student. Should a master syllabus be included with the proposal to address workload differences across sections? James noted there was no shared syllabus. Has the course workload changed with the current proposal in comparison with the previous course to take the more general student into account?
- What proportion of the 901 students listed as qualified each semester to take the course due to completing a prereq are non GEOL students?

Time constraints did not allow for completion of discussion of the proposal.

- Submitted by M. Milligan