

Minutes: Educational Policies Committee
11:00 AM - 12:50 PM, October 15, 2015

Present:

Laura Watt, Tim Wandling, Kathryn Chang, Jenn Lillig, Nathan Rank, Melinda Milligan, Laura Krier, Chiara Bacigalupa, Alvin Nguyen, Olivia Smith, Luisa Grossi, Richard Whitkus.

Absent:

Kristen Daley, Charles Elster

Meeting called to order by LW. Agenda approved with the following additions:

1. FYI- Experimental course MCCCFS
2. New Business:
 - a. MCCCFS revision
 - b. Letter to Prez Search Committee
3. Discussion Item: General GE processes and experimental GE courses

Minutes approved with NR's name spelled correctly in the September minutes.

Chair's Report:

1. Senate Budget SubCommittee: CSU Wide Report about creating a sustainable financial model for CSU- committee comments sent forward.
2. MM- how ExCom is reviewing info about the Prez Search committee (don't want to be awkward for our current President)
3. OS- some parts of the video of the presidential search committee meetings last week seemed to be cut out- LW will follow up on that

Business:

1. Sending a statement from EPC on the Presidential Search: LW drafted attachment from report from MM previously. Some members from ExComm was supposed to meet with the search committee last week but it was canceled for some reason. Information provided is likely to go into the packet to advertise the position.
 - a. NR- looks good. Maybe the last sentence could be more about the search itself. "We urge the search committee to convey the seriousness of the situation to the candidates and
 - b. TW- the senate might want to weigh in on this since we report to them. The audience should be everybody- not just the search committee. Nobody else can advocate for Academic Affairs. Some others might want to be boldfaced in the document.
 - c. JW- maybe we should just say what we want: "Given this report, we prefer a president that will prioritize tenure-track hiring...." And we want them to do it, not just think about it.

- d. MM- "In order to meet the needs of the campus, we need a president that will...."
- e. MM- The current president has also respected the faculty process in terms of curriculum- maybe that should be added to the document. But doesn't want to alter the impact.
- f. LW- deadline for sending in comments to the Prez Search committee is coming up soon. MM indicated that there is no deadline put onto the website for comments.
- g. TW- liked comment about realignment of resources with mission; after no-confidence vote TW and Scott Miller met with some of the board members – they said it was lamentable but that we should send that message to the Provost as well as the STAR and the paper. We should add the Provost into the conversation loop about this. Consider the word 'core' rather than 'overall'- that is what we do.
- h. CB- do we have the data to update how many faculty we have?? Does the current count include hired (vs. those who have left). Not sure if there is anything more clear or available.
- i. LW- revised version will be posted on the EPC Moodle and LW will bring it up at the senate meeting.

2. Discussion Item: GE process and Experimental vs. Non-Experimental classes

- a. LW- SCI 220 course has been proposed experimentally for Area E. But the MCCC was not marked that way (Dean requested it not be marked as GE for spring.) SCI 220 has been through SST Curr Comm, they are going to the Social Sciences as well. But it has gone to the GE committee. Has raised a larger issue: how to deal with courses that are experimental GE and the ARR (experimental aren't coded into the ARR but if they are approved for GE they do need to be coded because substitution form for GE is a big process). Should experimental courses carry something like GE since they are experimental.
- b. MM- experimental courses are being picked up in the ARR by GE but it doesn't show up in the major section. RW says that is different than what Katie says.
- c. TW- there was a lot of back and forth last year between GE and EPC. Where in the process does the Revised GE course process form reside? LW- with GE SubComm (not EPC). LW sent the form EPC commented on back to GE (LW sent it to Heather Smith and it is supposed to be agenda for next week but it's not). Do you need social scientific knowledge to teach in Area E? Like the engineering course last year.
- d. JW- faculty background is not currently a criteria in GE approval. If it is important then it should be in the process.
- e. MM- current proposals going through under the former process. We shouldn't extrapolate to "if we had the current proposal." People aren't following the steps.
- f. TW- the current system is being followed and other schools have no recourse when there GE areas end up with other schools putting

classes in. There is another force – SST is trying to put classes outside of their Area B. What is driving this. Re: Why isn't SCI 220 going into Area B3? Not sciency enough while Social Sciences wouldn't think it was Social-Sciency enough.

- g. NR- was at the GE meeting. NR was involved in a grant that had to deal with the SCI 220 course. When it comes to learning outcomes and GE curriculum structure- GE program review spent a lot of time on that (NR lead the program review), Area E has been taught in by multiple schools. Jeremy put a lot of effort into how SCI 220 would meet the learning objectives for Area E- and that is why it is not in B3. This course would only have 40 students and the proposer is making an honest and sincere effort- and it is awry that it is causing such strife. The process is getting messed up by politicizing of the issue.
- h. JW- maybe we need a taskforce to discuss the political nature of this new issue so that we are not arguing and insulting each other. SCI 220 is not the only course where this is an issue. It should be discussed outside of current proposals.
- i. MM- there are lots of openings in the process, besides the learning outcomes, where these faculty qualification issues can come in so that the GE Comm can make a decision overall.
- j. TW- we should really consider what needs to be done to serve the institution. There are resource implications when new classes are added. Faculty want breadth- lots of different approaches to GE. Maybe a joint task force.
- k. NR- GE course proposal form (after GE program review)- a proposer needed to describe implications of the new course on other courses in the GE area (in terms of enrollment changes). That piece was missing for the SCI 220 course- proposers aren't asked to report that anymore. But it is an important consideration. It can be hard to get that enrollment data though. Also a problem that whole bunch of courses went through governance a while ago without
- l. RW- this is a great discussion. Course should be judged strictly on its merit- but this problem has been ongoing for over a year. But on a higher level this political issue should be discussed. GE or 'core learning objectives' on other campuses have nothing to do with departments or schools. The university owns them. Fullerton and CI are going through GE review- Fullerton has redone their learning objectives and are checking current courses to make sure they match. Does this campus want to do that? Re-examine what GE means to this campus and how it is going to be assessed. WASC would love this and RW would be very supportive of it. It's owned by faculty but administration can support our process.
- m. MM- GE should be collecting that data on possible course effects of new courses. It's their job. Once a course is approved- it can be mounted anyway a department wants. For example, a course approved that was going to have 20 students could end up running

with 2000. In addition, courses could be approved for online and then offered differently.

- n. TW- schools are being pitted against each other. Some programs are starving to death. Departments are sometimes not allowed to teach some of their GE courses- which is why there is often back logs that other schools are coming into fill. Courses are essentially being defunded- especially through lack of TT faculty to teach in them. What is the data for how many courses are approved for GE and how often are they being offered and what is their enrollment.
- o. NR- we did all that work for GE program review (class sizes, modes of instruction, etc) and revising learning outcomes. Proposers should learn more about current offerings (as well as learning outcomes) and see how their course matches up. Drift should be smaller- i.e. a lab course shouldn't morph into a GMC course.
- p. TW- GE reform forced to have a higher SFR. Can we all agree to some common methodologies- a set of standards. For example, having 10 pages of writing or specific topics covered? What about certification that courses are actually doing it?

3. LW- RW shared a course proposal from Fullerton that is 8 pages long (posted on the Moodle). We aren't limited to our past processes- examples from other campuses would be useful.
4. MCCCf form revision: separating out add/delete a course from changes to an existing course
 - a. JW- where does pre-req changes go and who approves it?
 - b. LW- which changes even require the form or could just be done through catalog changes?
 - c. NR- a companion document would be useful- under what conditions would you use a form? LW- that will be the new curriculum guide
 - d. MM- form needs room for a before and after for changes to the course catalog. Or use track changes?
 - e. NR- needs to be converted to a PDF better than the current MCCCf. Font change issues, words cut-off, etc with current form.
 - f. RW- should just say "Semester Effective" Deletions should stay on the Changing to an Existing Course Form and only separate out course additions.
 - g. MM- add that people should indicate the effect of course removals. Approvals should be in an order that coincides with routing of the form. What about the school level- should their signature be added
 - h. JW- What about removals from catalog? School Curr Comms should be on the form. Spring effective dates when changes to the catalog happen in fall is confusing to students. Should this be dealt with?
 - i. TW- Does it affect the ARR for the major or the minor? Or does it change the catalog?
 - j. LW- effects to other majors of course changes really important. Notification to those departments is important.

- k. MM- catalog changes should be part of the third form (adding the catalog copy). The ARR change is on the form- but its confusing how to learn it.
- l. NR- a line added to tell chair where the CS codes are. LW- see the curriculum guide. CS codes don't match typically- out of compliance. LW- departments should review their CS codes.
- m. JW- instructions for departments trying to do joint curriculum changes so that changes happen together (getting on committee agendas together, keeping departments updated on changes that might affect the curriculums of others so everyone can work together)
- n. TW- departments should delete courses using a MCCC course if not offered after two years. Students have a right to courses in the catalog and if they aren't offered students have the right to take them. Catalog should be kept clean of these types of courses.
- o. RW- courses in the catalog that are required for a major and aren't being offered is a problem. Departments need to keep it cleaned up.
- p. LW- will work with the form suggestions.

5. Working groups:

- a. Policy for School CurrComm- Statement of expectations?
- b. Computer Class Lab Assign- tabled
- c. TW- the curriculum guide should be a living document owned by EPC- if people want changes to it then they would bring an amendment proposal. Ask schools what curriculum approval at that level means to them. The TA group is all from AandH- issue? Should be a member from FSAC as a liaison. (LW- but only talking about undergrads.)
- d. LW – group on What is a Certificate (policy development)- differences between certificate and a minor? Collapse with Curr Guide group. Is there a minimum number of units? MM- EPC lost authority over certificate course proposals- what about that? RW- should be on it since it's an Academic Program.
- e. 3 working groups:
 - i. Curr Guide and School Comm Guidelines (RW, LW, MM, LK (Felicia)
 - ii. TA Policy: TW, OS, KD (LW)
 - iii. SEIE Curr Guide and Certificate: NW, RW, JW, CB

Adjourned: 12:50 PM