

EPC Minutes
11/12/09

Present: Carmen Works (Chair), Sharon Cabaniss, Jenny Tice, Mateo Clark,, Elaine Sundberg, Armand Gilinsky, Thaine Stearns, Lynne Morrow

Meeting called to order.

CW requests that business items 1 and 2 on agenda be switched because discussion of form changes need to precede further discussion of program changes. Items 1 and 2 were switched and agenda was approved.

The minutes were amended. Milligan was changed to Barnard under the Reports section and the minutes were then approved.

Reports:

Program Review: Four programs still need to be reviewed. The following people volunteered:

Philosophy: MC; Anthropology: SC and CW; Liberal Studies (just the Ukiah program): TS and SC.

Geography still needs an EPC reviewer.

KG and MM are reviewing Theater Arts and will try to finish it this semester.

Questions of process for expanding the Napa liberal studies program to another external site in Solano were raised.

ES explained that the WASC documentation for the expansion of the Napa liberal studies program will be an appendix to the EPC document.

TS asked what the intent is in duplicating an existing state-side program. Is it duplication of courses or of a program? Are there gaps in oversight?

ES responded that EPC's charge is academic programs, including how courses are taught, questions of resources. It would be odd for a program to go the WASC without it being vetted through all appropriate campus bodies as well. If this program is the identical curriculum, then what is the role of EPC? How the program is delivered and administered is within the purview of EPC. ES reported that the suggestion of forming a campus advisory body for satellite programs had been taken to Dean Leeder.

Chair's Report:

CW presented the resolution drafted by EPC on super seniors to the Senate. The Provost expressed disappointment that the resolution did not include recommendations. CW suggested that the policy should be drafted by University Standards committee.

Academic Programs Report:

ES reported on the status of two policies that were approved last spring, revisions to the course repeat policy and course withdrawal policy. These revisions were to have been implemented this fall, but we lost our CMS team this fall. MB met with the CMS group and implementation of the revisions will occur in fall 2010.

SC asked what faculty do in terms of advising. ES answered that faculty should advise according to the revised policies.

No other reports at this time.

Business Items:

1. First reading of new GS forms: Reyna Laney presented the reformatted forms for new GE course proposals, which aligns language of new course proposal forms and modification forms. One procedural change calls for letter of support from School Curriculum Committee with administrative sign-off by dean.

Discussion of process—what about multiple school committees involved in course, why not have a signature sheet, how appropriate school committee would be decided, who weighs in on new courses.

ES pointed out this is a perennial question for GE (What is the school committee for new GE courses) as the curriculum guide is unclear. ES gave the example of where a new course would be commented on before going to the GE subcommittee.

RL: This is already being contested.

CW: What does “appropriate” mean (on revised form)?

RL: This IS controversial language.

TS raised a question of procedure and suggested that EPC needs to see all of the forms before adding signature sheets. At this point GE has proposed a process distinct from the Curriculum Guide.

RL: GE has proposed that only signatures needed are from the department and school dean. The comments from appropriate committee do not require a signature.

TS moved to extend the discussion by 5 minutes, which was seconded by MC and approved.

SB: The most logical thing is if GE subcommittee determines which schools are deemed “appropriate.”

AG: Why are there so many different forms, for new courses and for revisions? Why not just one form electronically?

RL: GE needs different forms for new courses and for revisions because of different needs that must be addressed.

TS: What is being proposed is a substantive change to the Curriculum Guide. GE should coordinate approval of new and modified courses. Disputes come to EPC.

RL: What happens procedurally?

TS: The existing forms refer to the Curriculum Guide. It is a problematic change to propose including language about “appropriate school committees.”

RL: GE needs direction from EPC.

CW tables discussion of forms until the next meeting.

2. Having passed the time certain for business item 2, TS moved to extend the discussion of new courses in Geography by 10 minutes. It was seconded by AG and approved.

TS moved to waive first reading of new Geography courses. Seconded by AG and approved.

SC moved to approve two new courses. AG seconded motion. Motion approved.

SC moved to handle proposed program changes in Geography over e-mail. Seconded by SG. Motion approved.

3. First reading of program changes in Sociology. Cindy Stearns from Sociology presented proposed program changes to create a field experience requirement. The rationale is to integrate sociological concepts with applied experience.

TS: Would you describe this as a capstone?

CS: It is more of an applied experience. They still have a senior seminar that is a capstone experience.

ES: I have looked at it [the course proposal]. It adds an important component to the major. It provides variety.

AG: What kind of staffing and resources will be required to set up and monitor the experience?

CS: Assignment will be on a rotating basis as part of the workload rather than as overload.

SC: Are we also approving the revision of 336 to 436 in this packet? Is this okay procedurally?

CS: The course will not be changed until the program changes are approved.

TS: The syllabus for the proposed course could be included in the second reading and then we could approve them together.

4. Resolution regarding double majors: CW reported on three points for discussion and possible action regarding the resolution sent forward from EPC.

1) The Senate wants a resolve clause added to the resolution that it be sent to the state-wide Senate.

SC moved to add such a resolution. Second by AG. Motion approved.

2) People in the Senate want more positiveness included in the resolution and more detailed rationale for why it is a good idea to allow students to double major.

3) People want a statement about how the resolution will contribute to students' ability to compete in a global economy.

There was general discussion about the resolution being positive in more than one place.

AG suggested that the third clause is probably the one considered problematic and this could be changed.

TS: I support adding a resolve clause but not removing the third resolve clause.

JT: The issue is not about double majors, but about students taking having more than 120 units.

CW: Yes, the issues have been linked.

LM: One issue is the impacted courses.

SC: If double majors have more units, they are probably upper division, which doesn't impact GE courses or lower division courses. The extra units don't hurt anyone and make it possible to maintain low enrolled courses in the major.

TS to JT: Has the student senate drafted a resolution about this?

JT: No, but we have set up a meeting with the Provost.

TS moved to refer the question of drafting a policy on double majors to the University Standards Committee.

Seconded by SC. Approved.

AG respectfully requested that the chair represent to the Senate our consensus that students with greater depth and breadth in their academic studies are more likely to make positive contributions to their communities and are more likely to be more competitive in the global economy.

Meeting adjourned at 12:53 pm