

Minutes from Educational Policies Committee (EPC)
Meeting Date: 10/30/08

Submitted by: Katie Hatch

Members Present: Carmen Works (CW), Karen Grady (KG), John Wingard (JW), Sharon Cabaniss (SB), Mateo Clark (MC), Sheila Cunningham (SC), Brantley Bryant (BB), Tristan Kelly (TK), Katie Hatch (KH), Robert Coleman-Senghor (RC), Lynne Morrow (LM), Kirsten Ely (KE)

Guests: Nathan Rank (NR) from the GE Subcommittee, Derek Pierre (DP) from AS

Meeting called to order at 11:00 a.m.

Agenda approved

Minutes from 10/16/08 approved as amended:

Amendments - Change spelling from Derek Pierce to Derek Pierre; note that Paula Crowley served as proxy for Karen Grady; on p. 3, change from SC to SB

I. Reports:

Chair of EPC – CW

- Sharing of GE pattern from 1989, with 3 unit classes and exceptions and master pattern course change
- Note that some people are trying to make experimental unit changes (may not be appropriate when it's a course change issue)
- Discussion of 16 unit standard for spring 2009 (proposed by Ochoa)

Graduate Studies Subcommittee- JW

- Grad curriculum guide will be developed/updated in same way undergrad curriculum guide was
- Plan for developing template for degree requirement guide; will have one place you can go to find links to other related places
- Plan for developing course repeat policy for grad students
- SB asked JW to inquire about interns for Admin and Finance and how they were admitted to grad programs. (The grad programs did not know that some people were admitted who bypassed the normal application process.) This issue has come up in Senate, too
- CW questioned standing for post-bac, university standards

APC - RC

- APC met with deans from ACAP; focus on how to align planning documents for long-range academic plan
- Question of Academic Affairs University Plan and coordinating all 3 planning documents; it was proposed to disseminate docs in way to bring into play faculty ideas at different levels within departments (so everyone

can contribute); Dean Leeder said there is a need for Education faculty to be involved

- Provost discussed 16 unit process; he views process as positive; gist of conversation – We’re going to have more cuts. Provost says we don’t have new demands on curriculum but we do have budget cuts.
- CW - Asked about fact we do have increased demand
RC – Stated that increased retention leads to increased demand on curriculum
LM – Brought up problem of misadvising leading to longer time in school
RC – Said university wide plan is being developed

II. Business Items:

1. Tabled motion on 3-4 unit changes in GE TC - NR

NR had recommendation and report for GE subcommittee. He returned to talk about issue of changing master catalogue, including GE modification form. Issue is that course changes are currently coming in piecemeal re: changing from 3 to 4 units.

NR gave history:

- Started with Biology request to make Field Bio a 4 unit course up from 3 unit (2 unit lecture and 1 unit lab). At time there was a GE moratorium, so couldn’t change, but now it is up for discussion. Proposal was presented to committee and committee decided to recommend to EPC approval.
- Next request – Experimental course in Theater 202, 203 request from Paul Draper re: trying out courses in 4 unit format. Committee member said they would consider this with course change form. Draper didn’t want this, which is why he wanted it to be experimental. Reality is that committee is setting up standardized way to review course change (unit issue?) because course already exists. But, others may want course to be considered “experiment.”
- Committee – Said it is willing to look at each situation based on its own units

CW – Said Elaine also had meeting with deans and deans said they will work on plan for whole school to address issue of things coming piecemeal

SB – Gave feedback for Field Bio course not to approve because it doesn’t meet requirements for 4 unit course

NR – Said Theater course is 2 integrated courses; also said GE committee wants to be aligned with EPC

CW – Concerned that unit change is not in spirit of experimental change of course so should not be used as such.

NR - Said he will bring feedback back to committee

JW – Asked: Given that there will be a number of exceptions to policy (see GE policy from 1989), at what point do you change policy?

RC – Stated when you don't have policy in place, you can't grandfather someone in. Clarified that there is not moratorium on 3 vs. 4 units and in fact no moratorium on any course issue. Re: issue of units and experimental course, said that when you change number of units in course, there is curricular change. So, you could argue it's an experimental course.

LM – Stated need to put moratorium on course change and have discussion from deans. Expressed need for institutional agreement on policy change.

TK – Asked about benefit of shifting 3 units to 4 and what is definition of experimental course

CW – Stated benefit from 3 to 4 is that if you have course you need to put more material in, you can do this (pedagogical reason). Said that administration pushes it because it fits better into schedule. Said it is also a workload issue (12 hours is standard for faculty). Re: experimental course definition, stated that it has new material.

JW - Other rationale for 4 units is because students more likely to take four 4-unit courses than five 3-unit courses

CW – But, unit change does not take into account our courses aren't one size fits all

SB – Said EPC should have some input into decisions to go to 4 unit model rather than allow this to happen. Stated there is a need to ensure it has university-wide benefit rather than just benefiting a few departments. Departments need to know how their curriculum will impact rest of University. Said that we should invite deans to come give reports because we need to get their attention. Advised keeping moratorium.

NR – Said it would be good idea for GE committee to reconsider policy from 1989 of GE course, 3-unit standard. If decided there is justification for changing policy, can do that. If not, then not sure if moratorium is necessary given that policy stands.

CW – Stated that side door policy of change from 3 to 4 units is no longer happening because they have to come through committee (EPC) and adhere to 1989 policy.

SB – Clarified that 1989 policy addresses issues moratorium

RC – Stated that wholesale movement in A and H is not taking place because different programs operate differently (e.g., Music, Art have difficulty moving from 3 to 4 units). Recommends against moratorium on all 4 unit courses.

TK – Wanted to discuss merits of 3 vs. 4 units

CW – Stated one disadvantage is that students may have to take more units

NR – Said there is need to take into account that executive order is still based on 3 units, so there will have to be change

VOTE called on motion of moratorium on any change of 3 to 4 unit GE course until the provost and deans decide (?). Motion – NOT APPROVED (number voting?)

2. Approval of Learning Outcomes - Area B and E

CW - Stated need to vote on issue of GE learning objectives for area B (from packet on 10/16/08)

JW – Discussed process of how learning objectives were developed and how GE Subcommittee was involved

SB – Said that the way this was run was model for consultation and collaboration

KE- Said that GE subcommittee vetted very thoroughly the development of the GE learning objectives

VOTE to approve learning objectives – Unanimous YES for approval. (This will now go to Senate as consent item.)

3. Resolution regarding administration of the CLA (from 10/16/08)

KE – Clarified that only things she changed are in **bold**

KE – Moved to accept, JW seconded

VOTE to pass resolution– All YES except for 1 NAY

4. Students voting on EPC and subcommittees

CW – Recommended that EPC addresses prior to Senate voting later that day

TK – Stated respect for process and shared governance. Clarified that Assoc Students represents graduate students and undergraduate students.

KE – Suggested coming up with pros and cons so EPC can seriously consider it and can respond to questions about it

CW – Clarified who votes and does not on committees: Elaine is non-voting, liaisons non-voting, ex-officios non-voting, students non-voting

KE – Further clarified that students are non-voting members of committee but ex-officios are not members

SB – Voiced problem of having 3 year membership for students

DP – Stated that Structure and Functions serves as body to name people to committees and have delegated to Assoc Studs to name students to committees. If S and F has problem, it has overall say. Clarified that we're not assuming students are elected to 3 year term.

CW – Stated that con is that language is not clear about 3 year term

KE – Said it would be impossible to have student on for 3 years. It it's important, language needs to change to accept student representative.

MC – Con is that there is wisdom to 3 year membership because you get greater grasp of decisions and politics. So, with students, there is less understanding because they are only on for 1 year. It is hard for them to develop knowledge base.

TK – Acknowledged the point, but countered that it is up to student to research and become educated on issues as member.

KE – Expressed concern about precedent. Said that school could vote in a first year faculty member who has less experience than student and this person gets to vote, so argument for student not being able to participate does not hold up.

RC – Stated issue of which committees students should be on and wanted examples

BB – Spoke as 2nd year faculty member who is a replacement on a committee. Expressed view that there is pro of helping students get in touch with matters, just as new faculty do this. Stated other pro would be that to help faculty reinforce ideal of shared governance re: issues with governance (i.e., would not be hypocritical).

MC – Stated that other pro is that it brings fresh ideas to have student members

SB – Stated that if elected, student should be under same guidelines re: attending committee meetings

CW – Clarified that if one rep misses more than 2 meetings, committee tells Laurel and a replacement is found. Clarified that number of students on committees is determined by Structures and Functions.

KE – Stated as a pro that S and F specifies the committees students should be on and areas where student input is necessary

RC – Spoke to issue of experience and 3 year assignment. Asked whether it is symbolic or functional to have students have vote (i.e., Are they actually being represented?). Pointed to number of “no’s” in executive column on Student Voting Status on CSU Academic Senates, EC and Committees. Stated that he thinks students should have vote on EPC.

JW – Said that if student is voting, it will be necessary to enforce attendance because absences change quorum.

DP – Stated re: quorum issue that students can’t be held to higher standard than others. Agreed that students would be held to same standard as other members.

MC – Asked if student reps have ability to bring motion and other privileges of members.

Answer was yes, students would have all rights.

KE – Stated as PRO: Currently students don’t always come to meetings because they don’t vote, so granting them the ability to vote would encourage commitment and attendance and would communicate that they are valued.

TK – Asked re: current polices: Since students are non-voting members, do they affect a quorum?

CW – Answered yes, they do affect quorum

BB – Moved to endorse resolution; this was seconded

VOTE: All endorsed resolution for students to become voting members except for one abstention

5. 16 unit cap for spring

CW – Introduced proposal from provost to cap student registration for spring 2009. You can view the new draft on Senate Talk. Cap would limit students to

16 units at Reg 1 and 2 up until open enrollment. Limit would then go up to 19 unless student received approval for more.

DP – Further explained: Provost stated that there would be blanket cap on 16 units except for graduating seniors. Students were very opposed in meeting with provost and expressed many concerns with process of how this happened, specifically re: the lack of consultation as well as with what actually happens with 16 unit cap. Stated that now students feel it is fair compromise to have 16, 16, 20 set-up. The proposal is now in draft form.

RC – Questioned whether provost has treaded on the prerogative of faculty and if unit issue should be looked at as a resource question or curriculum question.

JW – Asked Carmen whether she was consulted on this matter

CW - Responded that she was told of the plan and asked for comments but not otherwise consulted

SB – Asked if students could take more units if they have certain GPA. Stated need for exception for students taking Learning Skills courses who likely won't have GPA exception.

CW – Stated that EPC will challenge this plan because the EPC should have been entity to initially craft this

LM – Said that unit limit will present conflict for students who are using units for minors

KE – Stated that she understands but does not agree that SSU's primary goal should be to get students out on time. Said that it is important to talk about need to balance issue of moving students through and financial issues AND faculty's pedagogical duty to make sure they have time to understand concepts and material in deeper way.

LM – Expressed agreement with Kirsten re: pedagogical reasons for limiting unit load. Also stated understanding that seniors should have exceptions

Meeting adjourned at 11:50.