

EPC Minutes – 10/9/14

Meeting called to order at 11:04am

Present: Melinda Milligan (MM), Chiara Bacigalupa (CB), Christian George (CG), Armand Gilinsky (AG), Patricia Kim-Rajal (PKR), Alvin Nguyen (AN), Felicia Palsson (FP), Nathan Rank (NR), Elaine Sundberg (ES), Laura Watt (LW), Tia Watts (TiaW), Tim Wandling (TimW)

Agenda approved without changes.

Minutes from 9/25/14: Unpluralize “Laura Watts” in 1a; Note lack of clarity in discussion of University Task Force due to use of pronouns (especially “we”). Brief discussion of appropriate level of detail in minutes.

Minutes approved.

Consent item: ES 210 “Digital Circuits and Logic Design” – CB requested that we move this to a business item.

Old Business:

1. WordPress Website Development Certificate – M. Weisman

M. Weisman attested to the demand for expertise in WordPress; she also noted that the proposed instructors are new to teaching, and she will be on the alert for any possible problems that might arise from that. Including a service learning component would be up to the instructors. The acronyms in the proposal are now spelled out.

CG: price? \$1600 – is that comparable to other universities’ offerings? Merith: it is much cheaper.

AG: move to approve; TimW seconded. Passed unanimously.

Chair’s report:

1. Follow-up on email conversation re: reviewing MCCCFS – MM will set up a separate Moodle page for these & will post them there, organized by School/category. It’s hard for her to determine which are “minor” or “simple” vs. “complex,” so prefers to post them & let us determine whether we want to see them or not.

TimW: concerned about MM doing too much work! ES: there used to be a list of which changes were “minor” or “major”; might want to revisit that list? But it’s still variable in terms of what might be considered major or minor changes. MM: agree, it’s really squishy to make these determinations, so would like to try this process for a while. NR: supports this suggestion.

2. MM was contacted by someone who may want to bring a non-academic “maker” certificate to EPC, who seemed unclear about the process at this point – just wants us to know this *might* be coming. CB: the same person contacted me, and I suggested that she contact the SEIE committee.
3. SEIE Curriculum committee HAS met, but don’t yet have a Chair so not yet conducting business.

New Business:

1. Advanced Practical Clinical Education Certificate – Nursing – M. E. Wilkosz and D. Roberts – first reading

MEW: Eight-unit program that is grant supported – directed toward graduates who already have a FNP degree or other advanced training. Units composed of one 4-unit didactic class (N522A), a 3-unit residency (N535A), and 1 unit of N596 Special Project opportunity working with the Nursing faculty (all of these courses already exist as part of masters track). Anticipate a large pool of potential candidates for the class, both from their own FNP graduates & those from other programs; this might also possibly be applicable to DNP programs.

AG: Suggests some clean-up of proposal, including price, units, target audience etc. more clearly in the narrative. And, given the shortage of nursing faculty, how much will this add to your workload? Concerned re: a recent program in Nursing that was discontinued due to over-burden/lack of resources? MEW: the previous program that had to be discontinued had very small classes & did create an imbalance of resources, but this program would be in better balance.

CG: on addendum, info re: student fees, could that be clarified to be for this specific course? And does financial aid cover this? MEW: students can apply, but must have min of 4 units/semester.

DR: notes that many Masters-level FNPs being called upon to teach, and are required to have a course in education in order to do that, but their programs are generally aimed more at training practitioners, not educators – so this fills that gap. Due to grant funding, first cohort of students will receive a stipend to take the course.

TimW: impressed by this proposal. Hope it has the potential to morph eventually into something worth of state support.

MM: clarify N535 vs. N535A specifically (i.e. not B); and can you update where the planning for the program is at this point? As this was approved by SEIE over summer pending final approval, due to its being time-sensitive due to the grant funding. MEW: yes, this program is already underway, pending final approval (here at EPC).

AG: how many students in the first group? MEW: four. In view of the fact that you’ve already started, how important are cosmetic changes to this proposal for final approval?

TimW: move to waive the first reading, AG seconded. TiaW would support this if all our suggested changes get implemented for the record, which means we need to be specific about what changes we want. Approved unanimously.

NR: As this proposal go forward after EPC, those changes could be made for those next levels of approval.

DR: is it appropriate to put a set fee in proposal, in case it needs to be changed in the future?
ES: the proposal's budget sheet would just be amended down the road, so isn't a problem.

CB: have you checked the University on-line policy & make sure this is compliant? DR: yes, *quite* familiar with the policy & all that info is on the Moodle page.

LW moved to approve; TimW seconded. Approved unanimously.

More reports:

Questions for Chair re: her report:

AG: Notes that EPC's business has changed radically in the past year has been that most of our business is now taken up with certificate programs, and not so many program changes from the academic side – any comment on this? MM: There is more in the pipeline in the school's curriculum committees, they're just not on Horizon list yet. Also good idea to send out a strongly-worded reminder to Dept Chairs of Dec deadline for changes for Fall 2015 catalog.

TimW: curriculum guide needs to get completed & then be amendable – too many changes happening that are hard to keep track of. MM: our Cur Guide working group met over the summer, & working on Cur Guide being a “living document” & what those sections might look like; Sandy Destiny is still developing that architecture so that pieces can then get popped in.

NR: clarification of WHO should notify the Dept Chairs about upcoming deadline? MM will send. And re: Cur Guide, maybe set up a kind of wiki re: changes being made? Informally reporting out about implementation issues that proposer might want to know... Thinks TimW's suggestion is a good one.

More New Business Items:

2. University Studies Curriculum Committee Proposal – University Studies Task Force – J. Kornfeld – first reading

The two task force chairs couldn't be here today, but several members of the task force are also here, and AG as representing the task force will take us through proposal.

AG: clarified that the task force is NOT the same as the curriculum committee, and under “Composition of Curriculum Committee,” first bullet point, amend to add UNIV 103 to the list of courses.

NR: re: Composition of committee—it makes sense to have representation from each school, but given shortage of faculty for committees these days, how important is it that this committee have representation from each school, or could there be a minimum, or have it be optional? Or instead, have 2-3 at-large faculty?

TimW: made a similar point at the end of our last meeting, should the committee be made up primarily of people who are DOING this stuff?

ES: Isn't it often the case that the coordinators of these programs are also faculty in the various schools, so could they have that dual role?

MM: Would need to clarify that faculty in dual roles still only have one vote.

CG: Peer mentors seem to be missing from this committee composition? They provide unique insight into this program.

JK: Both great suggestions – definitely want to allow the *opportunity* for people from all schools to serve on the committee, but perhaps not require it?

MM: It's often the case that positions go unfilled, & committee can still act as long as there's a quorum – supports idea of giving all schools opportunity to have elected representation. Also concerned about the number of coordinators required to serve, both re: size of the committee and also that they might not have the choice of whether to serve or not? And might having such a large contingent of coordinators affect how voting might go?

NR: Endorses CG's suggestion – also question about how to balance appropriate representation vs. best size of the committee?

JK: great question – tension between those who see developmental aspect of UNIV courses being key, vs. those who are more concerned with issues of academic rigor – wanting to ensure that there's a balance of those points of view, and that tension is actually quite healthy – so wants to keep those numbers roughly equal, if possible.

CB: building on JK's comments, suggests roughly 12 committee members? And thinks representation from each different category of UNIV courses is important, because those programs are so different.

AG: note that not all Schools are represented in UNIV courses currently, but might want to propose something down the road, so want to be sure no Schools are disenfranchised by not having representation among the current coordinators.

TimW: tend to agree with the last three comments. Would like an odd number of committee members, and suggests simply identifying a student member, rather than peer mentors per se. Suggests including language about what constitutes a quorum.

NR: Suggests trying to run this as-is, and see if enough people fill the positions.

ES: argues that it SHOULD be a peer mentor, not just any student – because the peer mentors are engaged in the pedagogy of these courses, and so bring that quasi-instructor role to their representation, not just as a student.

CG: Concern that if peer mentors are equal stakeholders, should they have equal representation numbers-wise, and how would they be selected?

JK: could be current or past peer mentors, but yes, the selection process needs to be clarified. Also need to know when the group would meet, so that reps could plan ahead.

MM: question about how to fill all of the non-elected positions (possibly including peer mentor?) – what's the body that chooses, etc. And should the course coordinators also be past or current? Or clarify that these roles should be filled by the *current* coordinator that year.

NR: asks the task force members whether they want to take this proposal back & work with some of this feedback to make revisions? Answer seems to be no. Suggests maybe having one peer mentor & one other student representative, due to multiple duties on the committee -- how do student reps get chosen?

CG: Explained AS's process of appointing and approving student reps. Will work on some language re: student representation for second reading.

JK: agrees that the task force feels comfortable letting EPC work these details out.

MM: conveys EPC's thanks to the task force for all their hard work on this.

3. ES 210 Digital Circuits and Logic Design – Engineering – Bala Ravikumar and Meng-Chih Su – first reading

This was approved unanimously by GE Subcommittee but moved from Consent calendar to business item. Documents are all on Moodle page.

BR: Not a new course, is currently required for EE majors. In dept's review of curriculum two years ago re: addressing number of required units, identified a few courses that could move from majors-only to GE; it has subsequently been revised to meet GE requirements. Currently still being taught as traditional EE course, but the revisions would take place if approved for GE, to create wider appeal.

NR: S&T Cur Com discussed this proposal more than once, in April as well as August, and the new version reflects a lot of effort and feedback from their committee.

TimW: love the course, but do not think it belongs in Area A. Appropriate for EPC to consider, as it represents a critical shift in how GE is done. Will make his arguments in writing.

CB: Speaking as UNIV instructor, concerned about how critical thinking would be addressed by this four-unit course vs. a year-long 9-unit course – needs more explicit detail on how that would be covered.

M-CS: Two things put in: in the lab, to not just listen to theory of logic but to implement it, and so designed some very specific tasks that will take them through different stages of forming argument – also changed the assignment to emphasize this process of critical thinking.

TiaW: asks those who are on the GE Subcommittee, is there a definition of critical thinking, and is there a difference between that and logic?

ES: yes, defined both in the Executive Order, and SSU's own learning outcomes. This proposal has been designed to address those, and the GE Subcom reviewed the proposal for those elements and approved.

CB: There is a list from the Philosophy Dept of aspects they think are key to address critical thinking, and there are some aspects of this course proposal that do not reflect that list.

TimW: described contentious discussion of this in GE Subcom, despite the unanimous outcome – and asked whether the proposers looked at other schools require for their engineering students re: humanities?

PKR: notes there's a pre-req AND a co-requisite, will anyone other than engineering students be able to take this?

ES: There are other courses in GE that are primarily designed for those majors & that have pre-reqs (ex: Bio's series) – also addressed Tim's comment re: exposure to the humanities, noting they are required to take all 12 units in Area C, and that other CSUs have lower requirements than that. Believes this course does meet the requirements for A3; the broader discussion is important, but as it is currently defined, this course is eligible at the present. At other schools, critical thinking is spread across different schools.

MM: notes that we are in a first reading, & almost out of time – any info that we want to proposers to bring back?

NR: Recognizing that proposers have been working very hard to reach out to the GE process, rather than just requiring more units.

Meeting adjourned.