

Minutes for Educational Policies Committee Meeting

Held 2-07-08

(submitted by Kirsten Ely)

Members present: Thaine Stearns (TS)-Eng & the Chair, Steve Bittner (SB)-History, Sharon Cabaniss (SB)-Math, Charles Elster (CE)-Edu, Lynne Morrow (LM)-Music, Kirsten Ely (KE)-SBE, Karen Brodsky (KB)-Library, Lillian Lee (LL)-A&R, Carmen Works-(CW)-Chemistry, Dolly Freidel (DF)-Geography, Carol Blackshire-Belay (CBB)-Academic Affairs, Whitney McClure (WM)-AS, Katrina Svoboda (KS)-AS.

Guests: Will Johnson (WJ)-Music, John Kornfeld (JK) and Tom Shaw (TomS)-FYE, Nathan Rank (NR)-GE, Ada Jaarsma (AJ)-Philosophy.

Meeting called to order at 11:04am

Agenda approved

No Minutes from last time presented

Chair Report

--Program reviews: 2 person teams per handout. We need to determine dates to bring them forward.

--Carmen & Lillian are working on a recommendation for Univ 236

--Liaison for GE: Carmen. Nathan (Chair of GE) will report next meeting with their plan for assessment.

Vice Provost Report

--EMT—We have had conference calls concerning it being under review. One issue is the Unit 3 v. 4 question concerning our agreements about teaching assignments.

--One possibility is to restructure it and move it into AA for academic oversight.

--This brings up the same issues for the other UNIV courses. For example, UNIV 238—12 sections taught by SSPs (Unit 4) but it is Unit 3 work.

SC: Is it under program review?

CBB: No, not yet. First we need to restructure to find where it is housed and who has the oversight.

TS: APC is picking up the question of the feasibility of a School for this.

KB: Are we hoping to have something by the Fall?

CBB: Yes, we must. That's the agreement. We have to enroll students, arrange staffing, and determine the number of sections.

SC: We used to be encouraged to consider teaching these. Are faculty still be recruited?

CBB: Yes. We hope for a fresh new look—more TT (as originally done) would be a good thing.

Business Item 1. Revision to Master Catalog Course Change Form and New Course Proposal Form—Lillian Lee

TS: SC brought up who would sign the approval form for UNIV 150. But we don't really have a good new course form. The form in the packet is one that isn't in the master catalog.

Issue is whether the procedure is the same—Chair → Dean → Dean of Academic Program (morphed into Vice Provost but it is delegated to Elaine) → EPC

History has allowed UNIV courses to bypass EPC.

LL: Does the proposed form need revision?

TS: These are two versions of the same form. The Master Course Change form is used for scheduling.

LL: Can we delete the line for the Dean of Academic Programs, add a line for EPC Chair, and include a line for AA review and compliance.

CW: Confusion over forms—the Master Catalog form has not come to EPC

CBB: Should still come through AA so we need a line for it.

KB: Who signs at the Chair level if there is none?

TS: We can modify it to indicate that a program coordinator is okay in order to make it clear that we need a faculty signature.

KE: We might want to clarify that this would be only if there is no Chair by making it a footnote.

Business Item 2. Music: Revision to Existing Program: Will Johnson: T.C. 11:30am

WJ: We don't have all of the signatures but we have most. And, in particular, we have the GE signature.

There are two categories of changes.

Music Major: we separate out the music majors from the GE because the type of material that we should cover is distinct for these two constituents.

M105 Fundamentals for non-majors

M106 Preparation for majors

Survey courses (3): European music needs majors due to need to read music.

GE: Better focus the program on needs of the students.

LD/UD spread across C1 & C4 doesn't make sense.

Dropping 1 course and add 2 UD in C1

Move M101 to C4 focusing more on comparison and perspective

Adding a music and action course

Dropping other 2 C4 classes

WM: If a non-major decides to become a major, what happens given they haven't taken the right intro course?

WJ: We find a way to make it work.

LM: But taking the major course might be necessary in order for them to pass the exam that allows them to move on.

KE: Overall which courses are being dropped and which are being added?

WJ: Dropping 1 course

New courses: 106

251 & 252 (old 250A & 250B)

201

420

The theory is a problem due to he articulation agreements with the JCs.

TS: When it comes time for a motion, we could consider the GE and Major changes separately.

CW: Will majors still receive GE credit for M106 or M251 or will this increase their unit load because they have to take other GE courses?

WJ: C1-need to take M150 anyway

C4-take M350 anyway

So no additional courses are required.

SC: 55/seminar fewer take a GE class

WJ: Depends upon faculty coverage. So, we can make up the numbers if we can staff them. Faculty sufficiency is an issue.

LL: 201—pg. 3 is blank—should it be?

WJ: Yes.

TS: 2nd reading is expected to be scheduled for 2/21

Business Item 3. Proposal for Permanent Course: UNIV. 150: Freshman Year Experience—John Kornfeld: T.C. 12:00

TS: Our primary question is what recommendation we wish to send forward to the Senate concerning the proposal. The question of who signs the approval sheet and the name of the course is secondary.

JK was requested to report on changes from last time and anything else that was new.

JK: Changes

1. No cover sheet—it didn't apply—and we need direction on who signs
2. Outcomes are now less confusing in terms of their mapping into A1 and A1.
3. The A1 v. A2 issue: Greta (English) wrote a letter indicating it's okay to do A1 before A2.
4. 100 v. 200 level course (A1)—the question was brought up as to whether we can replace what is usually a 200 course with a 100 level course. There doesn't appear to be a real difference between courses that are 100 and courses that are 200 generally so this is not seen as being a problem.

NR: The numbers (100 v. 200) don't always reflect developmental pathways.

JK: Should be thought of in the context of GE as a whole.

5. We were asked how FYE has evolved as a result of assessment—there is an ad hoc list in your packet. Highlights—we incorporate more university-wide opportunities into the program; it's taking on a momentum of its own.
6. We fixed the finances mistake pointed out. The budget provides a firewall against the devolution of the course over several years.
7. Workload—4 units but 6 hours of being there. Every program does not always adhere to this. It's a tradeoff. Some benefits are PD & \$1,000 stipend

TS: Our approval issue: our focus is on it as a GE course proposal.

CBB: Budget—make sure to include administrative staff support in the budget.

SC: Workload—a. Students receive 9 units but faculty only get 8 → is this a good idea?
b. What about English 99?

JK: a. No answer but it happens in a number of places.

LM: In Music faculty get 1/3 unit for each lesson while students get 1 unit.

JK: b. Argument is that FYE is elitist because it can't be taken by students who have to take English 99. However, that's no longer the case since it gets A1 instead of A2 credit. It focuses on oral and written communication but not on the nuts and bolts so students can take it at the same time as Eng 99.

WM: I'm confused. There are 170 students. It's \$194/stu for these students and \$22/unit. What happens to other students?

JK: It would have to be changed to scale up. Also it doesn't get filled up instantly so it's not as if lots of students are being kept out of it.

KE: I don't think we should worry too much about whether this course costs more than the average GE course because we don't really know how much any GE course costs. There are undoubtedly lots of courses that cost more than the average. For example, the high cost of individual music lessons for music students—costly but necessary.

CE: The relation of Univ 150A to B: Can they do A without B?

JK: Yes. They leave with 5 elective units but no GE.

CE: Can students do B without A?

JK: No.

CW: What % of students in FYE placed into Eng 99?

JK: None because it was a prerequisite.

SB: The FYE faculty say it is a huge workload but that it is an overwhelmingly positive experience. It may not founder on budget but it may on interest. Will we exhaust the 20% of faculty who love this program in a few years? I worry that the extra 1 unit of volunteerism will be expected of new faculty.

JK: It may be somewhat worrying. In meeting with deans they all say they're strapped. But it would take a long time to go through the 20%. Hopefully, the community will meet to talk about this in the context of scaling it up in order to reduce the workload.

AJ: Is there a disincentive for adjuncts because it doesn't count toward entitlement?

JK/CBB: We need to look into it.

TS: Reminder: we are looking at the curricular aspects of this.

CBB: Clarifying: Talking with the deans to encourage participation—that's how the EMT program started out.

JK: That's a good reason to keep it small.

SC: The big issue is the budget. There are some departments that can't afford to hire Administrative Coordinators.

JK: Approval as a permanent course doesn't mean it couldn't be cut at some time due to lack of the budget. If it has curricular value, approval of the course per se shouldn't be held hostage to the budget.

TomS: The qualitative comments really portray the value of the course to the students. They make it clear it is a bridge to help students transition from high school to college. When weighing the budgetary value of the course, one should consider the value of such a bridge.

CE: The course description—it says 1st year students; does it really mean freshmen?

JK: Yes, it should be freshmen.

SB: Can we assume that the proposal applies a cap to the size?

JK: Yes—changing the cap would have to be part of any scaling conversation.

WM: Why don't students receive GE credit after the first semester? Is it because the GE content occurs throughout the year?

JK: Yes.

TS: As faculty what we have is “legal” and principle control over curriculum. Our primary job is to push curriculum forward. It's good to encourage imaginative proposals.

KE: I move to approve Univ 150 as a permanent course.

DF: I second.

CW: Curriculum—the people teaching it are not experts.

JK: We have PD workshops with “experts” to help. In addition, I can teach critical thinking per se, just not the philosophical theories. Overall it's a cost/benefit tradeoff

between “expertise” in critical thinking theories and teaching students to apply them to other aspects of their lives.

CW: Is Philosophy committed to holding these workshops for the duration of the course?

JK: Yes.

Vote: JK requested a count. Passed—7 in favor to 2 opposed.

Adjourned at 1:00pm.