

Educational Policies Committee
April 28, 2022
Meeting Minutes

Present: Emily Asencio (EA), Kristen Daley (KD), Sheri Schonleber (SS), Matty Mookerjee (MMo), Katilin Springmier (KS), Melinda Milligan (MM), Michael Ezra (ME), Lucia Grossi (LG), Sergio Canavati De La Torre (SC), Christina Gomez (CG)

Katie Musick (KM), Jenn Lillig (JL), Kari Manwiller (KM), Derek Girman (DG), Stacey Bosick (SB), Megan McIntyre (MMc)

Absent: Monica Lares (ML)

Meeting called to order by EA (10:00am)

Agenda: Approved.

Consent items Approved:

AMCS 360, CALS 351, ECON 496, EDEC 572, MATH 320, MATH 420, MUS 350, PSY 250, PSY 307, PSY 313, PSY 314, PSY 322, PSY 325, PSY328, PSY 335, PSY 338, PSY 342, PSY 352, PSY 358, PSY 360, PSY 362, PSY399, PSY 410, PSY413, PSY 418, PSY 425, PSY 430, PSY 461, PSY 466, PSY 485, SOCI 201, SOCI 326, SOCI 431, WGS 300

Minutes: 04/14/2021, approved.

Reports:

Chair of EPC, Emily Asencio

We need to have a discussion about what EPC wants to see from the GE (e.g., when do we want to see syllabi, etc.). If we don't have time to discuss this today, we will have time to talk about this more in our next meeting, which is our last meeting of the year (therefore no new curriculum items).

1. ECON 204 (TC 10:05 Florence Bouvet (FB), not present at the beginning of the discussion).

EA: Pulled off of the consent calendar in the Fall, because of the 4-unit exception. There wasn't anything from GE about this because it was the same rational as previous course that have come through recently.

MM: SSCC sent a memo where they argued against this exception. Without a lab, the rational for this exception is not compelling. The memo is in the EPC shared folder.

FB: Want it to be 4-units to keep makes it consistent with STEM fields. With the more mathematical content, there is not enough time to teach all of the content with only 3 units.

MM: The exception document describes how this 4-unit exception benefits the ECON majors, but does not address whether it serves the GE students who would need to take an additional GE unit in this category.

FB: Trying to serve GE students who take this course but then later decide to become ECON majors.

CG: Sees the benefit of having 4 credit GE courses and 4-unit classes can be very helpful when you are down by one unit. Students have the autonomy to choose either a 3-unit or a 4-unit GE course.

FB: If we were to create a barrier between the GE and major students it would create an issue for the ECON department/major.

MM: Would this course fit better in area B? (where these exceptions generally occur associated with labs)

2. MUS 105 (TC 10:30 Andy Collinsworth (AC))

EA: This was a consent item that was pulled from a previous meeting because the syllabus was missing things (GE learning objectives)

AC: Not my course, but I am here to represent this course. Looks like "he" (Brian Wilson) put his GELOs in the proposal that are not in the syllabus. I will kick it back to him to do that.

EA: It just has to be three of the GELOs.

KS: I think I was the one that asked to pull this because the GELOs were not in the syllabus, and this was also a more general question for the committee about what we wanted to see.

JL: I can hold these issues at my step in order to not take up committee time with these sorts of issues.

KS: Moving to waive the first reading.

SC: Seconded.

KD: Do we want to see these GELOs first?

MM: We can vote in the second reading to pass it contingent on adding the GELOs to the syllabus.

Motion pasted.

KS: Moves to approve the course after Emily receives the updated syllabus and signature assignment with the GELOs.

KD: Seconded.

Motion passed unanimously.

3. WGS 398 (2nd reading) (TC 10:45 Lena McQuade (LM))

EA: We wanted to check on something with regards to the internship policy. I reached out to Merith to ask about whether a course that was not in alignment with the internship policy would be covered by our insurance. She said “it is unclear,” but she could not interact with a course that is not in alignment with the policy.

SB: I would like to bring this to risk management myself.

MM: We talk about this for a long time, and it was explicit that internship courses should be a CS code 36. This course takes two different types of courses and marries them, but it should be 3 units of CS 36 and only one unit of CS code 02. A CS code 02 does not accurately represent the nature of the course. It is more honest to have two courses. Aside: there may be several/many courses on campus that are not in alignment with this policy.

EA: We might discuss this next meeting, i.e., how to recertify internship courses in light of the new policy.

MM: Also, this proposal also is asking for all three learning modes. Could only approved for face-to-face right now, but the syllabus is associated with an online mode.

LM: To clarify, this is a face-to-face class that meets in person for 50min per week.

MM: When you look at the classroom protocol in the syllabus it looks like it is online.

LM: It has been online for the past two years due to the pandemic.

SB: If this course doesn't fit the policy, then maybe the policy should be altered.

EA: We have been waiting for the Provost's internship taskforce, and we could reconsider the policy with that input in the future.

SB: I would hate for a course to get boxed in because of a workload issue as opposed to curriculum.

EA: Currently not able to pass the course because it doesn't align with the policy

JL: Do we vote to deny it so that it can be deleted from Curriculog

MM: If the committee does not vote to approve it, then it just dies at the end of the year.

KS: It seems like the next step is to go to the Dean to see how to fund this type of course

LM: That's correct. The Dean has decline to fund it thus far though. This is why I want documentation.

EA: We need to put in Curriculog that the proposed course is not in alignment with the internship policy and what would need to happen to make it viable.

KS: Move to decline this course in its current iteration

MM: Seconded

Pasted. All yeses except one abstention.

4. Overlay Charge revision 2nd reading (TC 11:00 Sam Cohen (SCo))

SCo: Is overlay charge just WIC focused or GVAR more generally. We want to place GVAR in the charge to make it explicit.

MM: We also need to remove “assessment” from the charge.

KS: Can you speak to the removal of “assessment?”

SCo: There is not mechanism for us to “assess” and it didn't make sense to leave it there. Don't really know why it was there in the first place.

MM: It was modeled off of the GE charge, but it should have been taken off the original charge, but that didn't happen.

KS: Moves to approve

SC: Seconds.

Approved unanimously.

5. WIC/GWAR updates from Overlay

SCo: Had a meeting about WIC/GWAR. We decided to pause and think about other ways of satisfying GWAR. Better to have a more wholistic understanding of how GWAR is going to operate before going further with approving WIC courses.

MMc: It made sense to let departments think about how they could satisfy GWAR before having them scramble to propose new WICs, which they might not need to do if they ultimately come up with another plan for satisfying GWAR.

MM: How does this match with respect to the timeline?

SB: It will start for students with a calendar year of Fall 2023, and it is met in upper division, so there is some time.

MMc: Reminder: there are not enough WIC courses right now.

MM: We should differentiate between new WICs and recertifications.

SCo: I see value in that. I worry that the messaging might get messy, though.

MM: From the faculty perspective: we just don't want to have to do the same work twice.

6. KIN 430B (2nd reading) (TC 11:15 Lauren Morimoto) (See Curriculog); KIN 430D; KIN 430E

EA: From the first reading, we just wanted to make sure that these adjustments could be made behind the scenes.

JL: "Yes that's fine" (from the chat)

EA: Told Lauren that we could do this part without her today

MMo: Move that we approve.

KS: Second.

Passes unanimously.

7. Area F (2nd reading) (TC 11:30)

EA: Kim Hester-Williams (KHW) in the waiting room to join this discussion

EA: We were waiting for the cross-listing MOU, which we passed last week, so now this seems like a good time to bring this back again.

MMc: Reminder: The language itself is coming from the EO, so we cannot wordsmith even if we wanted to.

KHW: Wanted to verify that we are talking about the same cross-listing memo.

BS: Verifies

Ron Lopez (RL) joins.

RL: Make the point that some of the material/language might have different usages with respect to the terms: Chicano/a and/or Latino/a.

MM: Draw the committee's attention to the fact that one of the exceptions that could be applied for is to be upper division. This could create additional work to figure out exactly how this could be implemented.

KHW: Please clarify.

MM: Area F is supposed to be lower division, so you can't offer the upper division unless there are enough lower division seats available at a given time.

RL: I object to the idea that an Area F course would be offered as an upper division course from a department that is not Ethnic Studies.

MMc: Reminder: departments cannot offer Area F unless they cross list it with one of the Ethnic Studies departments. It has to be worked out before it comes to governance.

SB: Academic Program is working on a new Degree Planner. I mention this because we are trying to predict when students will be taking Area F. The Degree will help us assess how many students might be wanting to take an upper division Area F course.

MMc: We don't fully know what the challenge will be (those alluded to by MM), but we won't know until some course proposal start coming in. I remain concerned that we don't have enough Area F for students.

SB: I would go further and have GE decline to see upper division Area F courses. "We are not seeing upper division courses until we have the capacity to offer these courses."

RL: We can offer those needed seats if we are given the funds. This is in accordance with the OE. We need additional TT hires and funding to hire adjuncts.

MMc: Agree with SB but this form is not the place to "legislate" this. Since I am the one writing the call, I can make it clear that we are not looking for upper division right now, but the form should not include language about this.

MM: Proposed to amend with: "Area F courses are expected to be lower division. If the course is upper division, include any potential curricular impacts if the course cannot be offered due to a lack of lower division seats."

KS: Seconded.

Amendment passes unanimously.

EA: at end of meeting, so we have to continue this discussion next meeting.

8. EPC's requests for notes from GE (TC 11:45)

We ran out of time of this item

Information Item/Good of the Order: None

Meeting adjourns 12:00 pm

Submitted by: Matty Mookerjee