

## Educational Policies Committee

### Minutes

November 29, 2018

11-12:50: Academic Affairs Conference Room (Stev 1040)

Attendees: Jenn Lillig, Emily Asencio, Tina Watts, Kaitlin Springmier, Kathryn Chang, Melinda Milligan, Breana Archie, Luisa Grossi, Chiara Bacigalupa, Katie Musick, Jenny Bent, Christina Baker-Foley

### Call to Order

### Amendments to Agenda:

1st Reading: GE Program Revision TC 11:30

Curriculum Revision: ENSP TC 12:30

### Agenda Approved

### Minutes Approved

### Reports:

1. Chair of EPC (J. Lillig)

**Tenets of Shared Governance-** Joint task force from Chancellor's Office & Academic Senate have sent a *Tenets of Shared Governance* documents to CSUs for feedback. Some have accepted, some have not. Primary debate surrounds definitions/primacy of curriculum. Document will be addressed at Senate TC 4:15.

### Consent Items:

1. MCCCCFs for Review

**GEP** - Pulled because the MCCCCFs are partnered with a larger curricular revision EPC hasn't seen yet

**ANTH** - Pulled because syllabi do not conform to syllabus policy

**BUS** - Approved

### Old Business Items

### New Business Items

1. First Reading: Discontinuance: EDUC-TESOL Concentration TC 11:15 (K. Grady)
  - Discontinuing 1 of 6 concentrations within the MA program. Reasoning is declining enrollment. Employers are willing to accept certificates in lieu of concentrations. Currently, only 2 students completing the coursework. No new students are being accepted to the program.

- Recommended that K. Grady provide letters from School Curriculum Committees, Grad studies, and Santa Rosa Junior College.
- J. Lillig to send communication notifying campus of the TESOL discontinuance, allowing 2 weeks for public comments.
- Second reading at EPC for 12/13

## 2. First Reading: GE Program Revision TC 11:30

- EPC will go through each submitted document making sure information is clear, requesting more information when needed, and noting when things need to be fixed.
- J. Lillig maintaining a document that combines curricular concerns collected from all constituents. EPC will need to discuss the document at length at the Second Reading. *Statements today are only regarding items not already included on the document.*
- EPC recognizes and applauds GERS work to create the curricular proposal, and all the documents to accompany the proposal.
- EPC has all required documents except the resource statement, which will be provided by the Second Reading.

### **Proposed Statement of Purpose and Goals.**

- Concern re: No. 5- "*Fosters social responsibility of individuals **within** diverse communities*"- language seems to exclude individuals outside of diverse communities. GERS can wordsmith to include more inclusive language.

### **General Education Learning Outcomes.**

- Request for closer connection between learning outcomes & statement of purpose.
- GELOS are too numerous, too complex. Difficulty in training faculty to teach the GELOS, and assess.
- Suggestions for wordsmithing from MLL and A&H- GERS has addressed some of these in their most recent GERS Report & FAQs

### **What Constitutes a GE Course.**

- Hutchins Program has raised issues with providing their curricula under these new parameters. Faculty concerns re: UD GE in regard to prerequisites and reflective assignment
- Request for more concrete definitions and explanations of *when* a GE course can be 4 units.
  - This is further clarified in the *Implementation Plan* document.
  - Recommendation to incorporate language from *Implementation Plan* into 1c of *What Constitutes a GE Course*.
- Question regarding feasibility of current GE courses meeting at least 3 GELOS- how much work will it be for faculty to change their courses/syllabi, what happens if a current GE course doesn't meet 3 GELOS?
- Question regarding how frequently GE courses being offered.

- Not in faculty purview. *Implementation Plan* includes considerations on how to offer enough courses to ensure students can graduate in 4 years. Academic programs is hiring an Associate Dean to shore up this work.
  - GERS recommends a dynamic course list rather than paper 'pattern' of GE courses.
- Faculty concerns re: reflection assignment and implementation/assessment in their course
- Question re: professional development workshop- why only recommended in LD and required in UD?
  - GERS concerns over ability to provide enough workshops and faculty time. Preferred UD because of increased requirements in UD.
- How does the implementation of a new GE program affect current students, students who would want to change majors?
  - Students currently SSU, are determined by their incoming catalog term. There will be blanket waivers for students who will have to complete requirements under a new program.
  - K. Musik has done analysis and determined that the changes will affect very few students.
- Do met-in-major GE courses count if a student switches majors?
  - Yes, because the met-in-major courses have been certified as GE.
- Recommended: Charging departments to create a teachout plan for their majors, because often times what isn't counted is the total number of units for the major.

### **GE Pattern and Graduation Requirements.**

- Concerns of language: GE pattern v.s. GE program. Pattern refers to A-E distribution, and Program refers to Seawolf Studies (graduation requirements)
  - It is important to call it a *GE Program* and to not confuse it to the pattern to try to move away from students' checkbox mentality.
- If overlays are to be implemented later, should they be included in the program?
  - Addressed in catalog copy.
- Numbers in D should be removed.
- Recommendation the the map represent the overlays in a different way so they don't look like they are impeding progress. Potential orthogonal representation.

### **Graduation Requirements**

- *Ethnic Studies* potentially redefined as *Critical Race Studies* based on faculty feedback. Based on faculty focus groups, the definition and title of *Critical Race Studies (CRS)* more adequately describes current teaching practices and curricula at SSU. EPC will see and vote on CRS definition at second reading.
- Question regarding waivers for 2 year transfer students- will they be able to complete Seawolf Studies prior to arriving at SSU?

### **SeaLanes**

No questions or more information needed at this time, knowing that SeaLanes will be implemented at a later date.

### **First Year Programming**

- Questions regarding transitional content, availability for students who fail first semester.

### **Assessment Plan**

- Supplementary documents contain an assessment timeline. Documents should be remerged.
- Concerns about academic freedom, how faculty are expected to craft the assignment. Impact signature assignment will have on faculty teaching large sections of students.
- Signature Assignment No. 3: that the assignment “*is ‘cool’*”. Another term to better describe what makes a signature assignment ‘cool?’ Recommended: engaging, inspirational...
- Recommendation Academic Programs hire a full-time assessment coordinator from a national search to help with assessment of signature assignments.

### **Mapping documents show relationships between GELOs, EO 1100 Distribution Areas and Overlays. Is this document clear?**

- Recommendation to keep consistent EO 1100 ordering.
- Question about how LD GEs will meet 3 GELOs. Is it excessive? If there are only 1-2 assigned in an area, how does the faculty teach 3? What impact is that going to have on current syllabi?
- Are the learning outcomes inclusive enough to include current GE courses? How much work will faculty need to do to map current courses to proposed GELOs?
  - School representatives will ask constituents.
- All LD have interdisciplinary and disciplinary knowledge, but UD do not. Why is this?
  - Request to clarify the meaning of integration of disciplinary knowledge.

### **General/Overall**

- Ask that *Implementation Plan* document be included in revision packet. - faculty do not vote on as part of a curricular document. Any curricular revision that has come to EPC prior required an implementation plan, resource statement, etc. EPC wouldn't be able to vote to approve a new curriculum without an implementation plan.
- Suggestion to include a sample syllabi.
- Request to remove term *double-dipping* from GE implementation 11.26- supplementary document.

EPC will review Catalog Copy, Implementation Timeline, and Resource Statement in second reading.

### **3. Curriculum Revision: ENSP TC 12:30 (R. Laney)**

Developed due to a teach out plan of ENSP- the teach out plan includes 3 different majors and to 10 different concentrations. Tried to implement without a curricular change, however, it

requires a curricular revision because of a slight unit change. The program is not changing any requirements.

- Request to change assessment statement: “ENSP had to program assessment plan,” to “ENSP had no program assessment plan.
- Question on why GEP course is moving to lower division?
  - ENSP had to adapt to the new GEP major.
- Request to order required courses in numerical order in order to provide clarity to students on what LD and UD courses are required.

C. Bacigalupa move to wave first reading

M. Milligan second

M. Milligan move to approving with changes suggested

C. Bacigalupa second

**Curriculum Revision approved with suggested changes: “ENSP had no program assessment plan,” and reordering of required courses.**

Meeting adjourned 12:50

*Minutes respectfully submitted by K. Springmier*