Minutes: Educational Policies Committee
11:00 AM – 12:50 PM, October 29, 2015

Present:
Laura Watt, Olivia Smith, Chiara, Melinda, Luisa, Tim, Jen, Kathryn, Laura, Nathan, Richard, Alvin

Meeting called to order by LW.
Agenda approved with no additions.
RW clarification to minutes: experimental courses that are non-GE do not get coded into ARR, but GE-designated courses DO get coded. Important to be clear about this.

Consent Items:

1. All consent items approved.
2. Will continue the practice of putting MCCCFs out to committee ahead of time for review so that consent is quicker at meetings.
3. PORT 120 didn't pass GE unanimously; want to affirm our policy of dealing with these. One member of GE subcommittee didn't like the first reading was waived; we will clarify where we're at.
    a. Clarification from Melinda—we don't review experimental courses even if GE approval wasn't unanimous, unless there is a procedural issue.

Report from the Chair

1. Posted on Moodle page the final version of our comment letter to the presidential search committee. Was told by Richard that it did have some influence in how the statement for the candidates reads. Not sure what impact because it's all secret.
2. Revisions to MCCCF forms—LW made some edits and sent them back to Academic Affairs to see if we can get them moving forward. We'll probably need to talk about it a little more.
3. At ACT last week the WASC steering committee starting to do some preliminary data gathering. Members of the steering committee will be reporting back occasionally to either Ex Comm or Senate to keep people informed.
4. Resolution coming to Senate today about campus equity.
5. Video of the presidential search open forum: LW did find out at Senate that the gaps are drops in the Wi-Fi, not any intentional editing.
6. Curriculum Guide and School Curriculum Committees – we don't have purview over how they do their review. Who reviews courses to determine whether they meet GE requirements? GE Subcommittee is required to do this, but whether or not School Committees do this is up to them. School Curriculum Committees are supposed to comment on whether courses will have an impact on their area or on GE. These things could be spelled out in a set of guidelines—this is something we're going to be working on in the

future. There are a lot of small conversations circling around GE over the last few weeks. The clearer we can be in here it may help side conversations.

a. MM – With University Studies, which is in Area E, now all Area E proposals have to get routed through University Studies. They may choose to have a limited review but it's up to them.
b. JL—Aren't some conversations happening to make this process easier? It's GE committee's job to make decisions. If a department is going to make a proposal for a GE course can't they just send it out there and anyone who wants to make a comment can make a comment.
    i. MM—part of the process really is to go through the various curriculum committees. This is a central part of the process. All the curriculum committees have to be notified and to provide a letter as part of the process.
    ii. JL – Why do we have to have all curriculum committees approve GE courses?
    iii. NR – There are issues about implementation and about what the review process is supposed to be about. Effects on number of students enrolling in courses, what does a course have to offer that doesn't already exist. The routing is a real problem. Could be a three-month timeline to get new GE courses approved for each school committee. This is cumbersome and leads to problems. Stifles innovation. We have to come up with something a little better.
    iv. TW: A lot of these issues were discussed at GE last time. There are concerns that we could someday see a GE program that is all in one school. Should the form privilege certain schools and departments for review? Going against the idea of certain classes being traditionally taught in certain areas. Send it to the schools in which they're traditionally housed. Should probably be spelled out in the curriculum guide about how long committees have to respond to proposals. It's not like schools have veto power right now. TW is in favor of a routing system that does send things to the "right" departments.
        1. LW: Part of why this additional curriculum committee review was heightened when the massive deans' course was approved and didn't get much review. Only question was whether it met GE but didn't talk about the impact it would have on other courses.
    v. JL: Every school has representation on the GE subcommittee—shouldn't that review be considered enough for approval? Why also the curriculum committees? What is the job of the curriculum committee? Helping people build strong programs in the major. GE is a university-wide thing where we're all playing together.

1. MM: GE reps don't have the same ability to do the same kind of review. They're experts in GE. They don't know how it's going to affect everyone in their school. Too much for the rep to understand and know. The length of the process can be a problem. If curriculum committees are only meeting once a month some of their business should be done by email. They shouldn't have to have first and second readings. It's essential that courses go through school curriculum committees.
2. NR: On the side that Jen is representing. When he was on GE he met with deans and other people in the departments, it didn't have to be routed through all these committees formally. Schools can figure out whether a proposal is coming through that might be a concern without having all these processes involved. We're currently seeing high quality proposals not being moved through because people aren't conducting business effectively through email, because there are delays in the process.
3. RW: Differentiate between permanent vs. experimental GE. With experimental you want it to be quick and responsive. With permanent you want to be more deliberate. Right now the process is the same for both. Right now experimental courses don't go to school committees. Right now people aren't clear about where things are supposed to go and who has to approve each thing.

vi. JL: Melinda has a point about who can be the experts in each thing. Questions about impact on enrollment aren't GE questions. Need to separate out whether something affects other courses from whether it is a good GE course. If we started routing all course proposals through EPC to determine course impact our workload would go through the roof.

vii. TW: A&H Hat on—A&H wanted to revise the curriculum into pathways. Just breadth requirements. Our structure just doesn't work. People are concerned about the process. Is there a "GE-ness" to each of the GE courses that are approved? Schools should be able to approve their own courses for GE. Our GE structure is problematic. Now the forms say "route to all schools." Combine the experimental and permanent into one process.

viii. LK: What is the actual problem? The role of school curriculum committees in reviewing proposals that are coming forward to GE. This is a question because school curriculum committees aren't clear on what their role is.

ix. TW: Can we remove the University Studies review from the process? They aren't stakeholders. Why would we want to route them all there.
    1. CB: This wouldn't eliminate the problem
x. RW: From a structural perspective, another way to look at this: a course in a program comes up that's not GE. Why doesn't that get shopped around to all the schools? Because it has nothing to do with those schools. What is GE? Is GE something that belongs to schools or is it an institutional program? One way to look at it is that RW oversees GE; he's the "Dean" of GE. What is the GE committee? The GE committee is the equivalent of a school committee. This idea might help clarify what we're talking about.
xi. NR: One that that seems clear is that these packages for permanent courses should be complete. When they come to a school curriculum committee the school recommendation from the originated school should be there. It should help the committee understand why the proposal is important. The GE characteristics of the course are important all the way through. If we're going to go to the process of consulting, proposals should go to committees as an FYI; their recommendations shouldn't be needed for the packages to go to GE. EPC is the place where resource implications should be considered; it's part of our charge. If school recommendations are needed it can sometimes slow the process down.
    1. JL: We have to meet a consensus about what GE really means. Maybe the idea of the school of GE is a framework for these conversations.
    2. LW: GE Program Review is coming up next year. We're identifying some of the issues, but that's the real place where these questions should come up.
    3. MM: Concerned about the notion of FYI and what that suggests. Suggests that it's an opportunity for notification not input. Consultation is better. It's important to get that input. FYI makes people not care, makes it irrelevant. It's ok for the process to take awhile for permanent courses to be added to GE.

Report from AVP:

1. Program Review—consistent concern is that reviews never go anywhere. The Provost has heard this and is concerned. Starting this year he's going to close the loop with each program that does a review. Provost and Dean of School will meet with the program to talk about conclusions from the review. Provost will also respond to the meta-report from Program Review that comes through EPC.

Report from Vice-Chair of EPC:

1. SEIE Working Group—looking at certificate programs. Came up with a decent list of topics. NR will be the chair of the group. Input on what to do next?
2. Useful to look at SEIE website to see how these certificates are being presented now.
3. Looked at the Chancellor's policies/executive orders regarding Extended Ed and certificate programs. Specifically looking at issues around minimum units.
4. Also planning to consult with Bob Eyler, interim dean on programs.
5. Thinking about issues around what the approval process should be. More vague with respect to credit-bearing programs.
    a. MM—clarification that credit-bearing programs do go through the regular process for approval.
    b. Can we confirm that they report to EPC every time they approve a certificate? That's what NR wants to do.
    c. Eyler doesn't seem clear on what the SEIE Curriculum Committee is for and might not be as open to EPC review.

New Business

1. Revised Academic Schedule (RW): At the beginning of the year we looked at the proposed academic calendar; there were some issues. RW bringing it back to the committee to discuss holiday distribution that impacts Monday courses. Alternative to consider: move convocation to the previous Friday in 2018 and 2019.
    a. NR: I think that's a great thing to do. Some people won't be able to come, but a lot of us do, and it will start the week clean.
    b. JL: Gives us another week of lab.
    c. MM: Convocation attendance will probably drop way off. People will have to be comfortable with that.
    d. LW: Not sure that the numbers will change; people who do come probably won't find it onerous.
    e. TW: It might be better on a Friday to give people more breathing room before the semester starts.
    f. KC: Department and school meetings would also be moved to Friday? RW – yes.
    g. LW: Maybe we can improve on getting students there, letting them know about it.
    h. AN: Is this new or have we done this before? RW: Yes, we've had it on Friday before. AN: What would the impact be on student move-in?
    i. EPC approves this calendar change unanimously.
2. PORT 120 Proposal (J. Reeder):
    a. In 1999 first proposed the addition of Portuguese classes to the curriculum, one for beginners and one for Spanish speakers. Those two courses were approved for GE but were never taught because of lack of resources. In 2006 they dropped out of the catalog. Now we

have the resources to teach the 120 (for Speakers) once every four semesters, so they are re-proposing.

b. Course takes advantage of close linguistic relations between Spanish and Portuguese. Fluent Spanish speakers can learn Portuguese rapidly. Modeled after a class at UT Austin, which was taught by Reeder there.
c. Sonoma State doesn't have a language requirement, which contributes to us far behind the norm in how many languages we offer. Most schools offer more than 3 languages.
d. Portuguese is a global language—official language in 10 different countries across continents.
e. OS: Will this mainly be targeted to ESL students? 15-20% of the student population would be eligible. Pre-req is Spanish 202 or equivalent. Doesn't necessarily have to be someone who has studied Spanish, but they do need to have the necessary linguistic background.
f. MM: The course is great. GE didn't have any concerns about it in C3. Issue that needs to be addressed around the approval process. Was the proposal brought forward with all the right pieces in place in time for everyone to read? It moved too quickly through the process. It wasn't vetted appropriately.
g. NR: This shows us that the discussion we had a few minutes ago is really germane. We have to handle proposals in idiosyncratic ways. Move to waive the first reading.
    i. JL: What was the part of the process that was missing? University Studies didn't see all the pieces of the proposals. Formal response said it was fine to go ahead.
    ii. TW: None of these issues came up at GE. There were no problems with these issues. Seconds the motion to waive the first reading.
    iii. NR: Waiving the first reading because this seems like a valuable course. We don't need to ask Jeff to make any revisions.
    iv. Voted to waive the first reading.
h. MM: Should the MCCCF say Fall 2015 as the semester of change. Unclear on what date is supposed to be on the form. We'll add this note to our form revision process.
i. NR: Move approval of the course.
    i. Voted to approve the course. [Note LK had to leave meeting at this point, remaining minutes taken by OS]

3. Revisions to Career Minor in Arts Management (J. Shaw and M. Schwager):

The revision of the minor. This is a minor art directed towards visual art, could complement students who wish to pursue a career that involves art gallery work, teaching, or art history.

By updating this minor, classes will be more relevant to the minor. The content for the minor is the same.

Classes that were used for this minor were previously under "special topics" now they will be given course numbers that apply directly to the minor. Students that

had to take random electives to fulfill the minor will take classes specific to the major.
Students should meet with a department advisor to consult as these classes that apply to the minor are not offered every semester and a plan for the layout of the minor is recommended.
Concerns for the revision of the Arts Management Minor were the lack of learning objectives in the proposal. Also, it would be helpful to have a comparison of previous classes compared to new classes that will fulfill this minor.

Meeting adjourned at 12:50pm.