

**EPC Minutes**  
**April 28, 2016**

**PRESENT:** Laura Watt (LW), Rich Whitkus (RW), Kathryn Chang (KC), Hope Ortiz (proxy for Alvin Nguyen) (HO), Kristen Daly (KD), Luisa Grossi (LG), Chiara Bacigalupa (CB), Melinda Milligan (MM), Tia Watts (TWs), Tim Wandling (TWg), Nathan Rank, (NR) Felicia Kalker (FK)  
Guests: Ajay Gehlawat, Greta Vollmer, Patricia Kim-Rajal

**Changes to the agenda:**

- Added discussion of the Internship Policy at Executive Committee as a business item
- Renumbered discussion items from 3, 4, 5 to 1, 2, 3

**I. REPORTS**

**A. Chair of EPC (LW)**

- Laura reminded the committee that new proposals that are not decided today will have to come back for a first reading in the fall.
- The Academic Freedom Subcommittee sent a memo summarizing their position on the question of whether department decisions about curriculum can trump individual academic freedom. Their position is that departments can also be afforded academic freedom, and faculty members can be expected to teach in accordance with those decisions. In the case we discussed a few weeks ago, the Sociology department is within its rights to have a policy on service learning and can expect individuals to work within the policy. This issue will be going forward to FSAC today.
- The Senate Budget Subcommittee continues to review data, and will take its conclusions to the last Senate meeting.

**II. CONSENT ITEMS**

- A. Minutes from April 14 are being recovered at IT and will be approved next time.
- B. MCCCF's listed on Moodle as consent items for Apr 28 approved.

**III. BUSINESS**

**A. New MA in Film Studies**

Ajay Gehlawat (AG) presented a proposal for a new MA in Film Studies, to be offered as a self-supporting program through Extended Education. LW commented that there is no routing form in the packet (on Moodle), because a new one had to be created and thus does not have all of the needed signatures. AG made the following points:

- Students in the film studies minor have been asking for opportunities for further development in this area.

- Several faculty members have been interested in this idea for some time. Seven faculty members from the humanities are currently involved – more can be added as interest is shown. AG is looking for new course proposals.
- The Dean recommended the program be done through Extended Ed, so AG has been working with SEIE as well.
- The program consists of 30 units of coursework. It can be completed in two years with an average of 2 courses per semester.
- One track leads to a traditional thesis; the other track leads to a project in digital film-making. Students can take one digital film-making course before making their final decision about which track to pursue.

Questions from the committee:

- What does fast track mean? Answer: The program can be put on the agenda for the Board of Trustees summer session, rather than having to wait until January. Only self-supported programs are eligible.
- Why was a self-supported program chosen, since it will cost the students more? Answer: It is not possible to run the program state-side with current resources. The costs are actually competitive when compared with other programs.
- How will faculty be compensated for teaching? Answer: There is flexibility for faculty to either teach in load or as overload.
- SEIE's evaluation of the market included qualifying language that the program would not go forward if there were insufficient need. Should they do their marketing first? Answer: Greg Milton says they do see a demand, even without the marketing survey. A robust marketing plan already exists; the survey will only provide additional information about where that demand is greatest. Also the process includes provisions for a slow start – the expectation is that it will grow the longer it is around. In addition, the program is different from other programs in that it offers students a chance to take courses that are traditionally taught in either an MA or an MFA program – they get to sample both approaches. Thus, it may have more appeal than more traditional programs.
- Do you have a letter from the Dean that outlines the funding model and how the financial decisions were made? Answer: Yes
- Have you reached out to other faculty across campus who can be on the master's committees? This need could become a workload issue, so they should have a chance to weigh in. Answer: Participation on an advising committee would come with remuneration. Faculty with whom AG has spoken express interest and willingness to participate. Department chairs of the faculty who are in the proposal have said that they can spare the faculty this way.
- What about state-side students who want to take these courses? Answer: Students would have to pay out of pocket, but they can take the courses.
- What about SEIE students who want to take state-side undergraduate upper division courses? Answer: Students who sign up for a state-side course would pay open university fees. Compensation goes to the school, not the instructor.

- This financial model has not necessarily worked in other departments. How can you avoid having SEIE students take state-side courses and increase those faculty members' workloads? Answer: There is no existing state-side program, so students will not have the opportunity to do the same thing state-side. And SEIE students would not be let in above a course's enrollment cap. If several students wanted to work with a faculty member, an Extended Ed course would have to be developed to compensate the faculty member – perhaps as a kind of independent study.
- Where are the course descriptions and syllabi of the courses that were approved? What about the other courses that are listed? They need proposal forms, MCCCF's, and syllabi. Answer: The A&H Curriculum Committee did look at the three courses that are needed to get the program started. The templates for these three courses are in the packet approved by A&H. As new courses are created, they will come through the approval process.

Suggestions from the Committee for work to be done before the second reading:

- All documentation from previous levels must come to EPC, including MOU's between the A&H Dean and SEIE, the packet that was approved by A&H, and letters of support from department chairs of the faculty involved. In addition, there needs to be a more robust accounting of what the graduate studies curriculum committee discussed.
- Compensation for committee members and for faculty who have these students in their courses state-side needs to be clear and agreed upon in a MOU with SEIE. It should be clear who is compensated for committee work; historically only committee chairs have been compensated. Also, a plan for how students who do not finish within the expected time will be handled should be included, since they can be a considerable drain on a faculty member's time.
- The packet should include course descriptions, MCCCF's, and outlines/syllabi for all courses that are included in the program.

The question was raised whether MCCCF's can be completed for a program that does not yet exist, and it was pointed out that new programs have come through with MCCCF's in recent years. It was also noted that when programs are revised, new courses come to EPC with syllabi; the courses are not vetted independently of the program.

The committee also discussed the problem that the process by which SEIE programs that confer academic credit are approved has not yet been completely developed by SEIE and EPC. Committee members expressed concerns about trying to approve a program when the process has not been developed and finalized. Some committee members felt the lack of a process should not hold up this particular proposal, while others felt that this proposal can, and should, wait until the process has been finalized. It was noted that waiting for approval until fall will not delay the program's proposed start date of Fall 2017.

It was noted that these requests do not constitute reservations about the program. Committee members expressed enthusiasm and support for the program. Reluctance to move forward without the above elements only comes from a need for consistency in how programs are

approved and the need to ensure that the next levels have what they need to keep the proposal moving forward.

It was also noted that the questions raised in this discussion about resources should be sent to APARC.

The final decision on this item was that the proposal should come back in the fall, when it will have to have another first reading due to changes in committee membership. MM expressed willingness to work with AG on getting everything in order so that this item can be dealt with efficiently in the fall.

### **B. Modify Policy on Enrollment in Thesis Courses**

At its last meeting, EPC reviewed the proposed modifications. The proposed changes explicitly state that a GSO1 form must be approved before a student can enroll in thesis units (more than 1 unit). At that time, committee members questioned whether the new policy can be carried out in practice. RW took this question to the Graduate Studies Subcommittee, where no coordinators expressed reservations about the policy. One EPC member continued to feel that students in his department would have difficulty completing their requirements in a manner that would match the new requirements. It was suggested that the programs may need to adjust their own policies. KD moved approval of the modification. NR seconded. Yes =7. No = 1.

### **C. New Internship Policy**

MM proposed that EPC endorse the Executive Committee's letter asking that the new internship policy go through full governance approval, since the policy does have curriculum implications and influences student's academic learning.

MM moved that EPC endorse the memo titled New Internship Policy, which was written by Richard Senghas to Provost Rogerson. HO seconded. Motion passed with one abstention.

## **IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **A. Report on A&H's Writing Intensive Courses Pilot**

Greta Vollmer (GV) presented an update on the A&H Writing Intensive courses pilot. She made the following points:

- WEPT passing rates have stayed the same, but anecdotally, the quality of written arguments seems to be lower than in the past, and some students would benefit from additional support throughout their college careers.
- The intention of this pilot is to find writing-intensive courses that already exist and structure them to provide writing instruction at the upper-division level. Course have to enroll 25 students or less (to enable a good revision process), and faculty need professional development to help build their skills in teaching writing.

- There are five courses in the current pilot. Current students and faculty are completing surveys, and student writing will be assessed for growth over time.
- Next year four courses will be added, including two sections in Nursing (outside A&H), so that next year there will be 9 courses.
- Faculty teaching for the first time receive a stipend.
- There is ongoing concern that there might not be sufficient faculty who really can devote the time needed. In the long run, the program needs a director with dedicated time and teaching assistants.

Questions from the committee:

- Will the courses replace the WEPT? Is there a limit to how many courses might be offered? Answer: The intention is that eventually every department would have a course. No intention to replace the WEPT completely.
- Last year, we decided that the courses in the pilot should come to EPC. That didn't happen. Would you be willing to write a report to the EPC chair to report on the courses and this year's results? Answer: Yes, VG will do so.
- What action can we take to support the pilot? Answer: EPC could send a letter of support to AA, including a request that the provost support professional development for faculty in the program at a level that would enable the program to be opened up across campus.
- Are you done with decisions about who is in the pilot next year? Could you put out an additional call? Answer: Currently we do not have the funds for additional stipends. This year, the A&H Dean is providing stipends to A&H faculty. It would also require a commitment of the new coordinator's time, since GV is retiring. LW said she is willing to talk with the new coordinator (Scott Miller) to find out if he's interested in EPC encouraging Deans in other schools to support the program.
- Are there any safeguards in place if there were sections that were not successful in helping students attain sufficient proficiency? Answer: The courses will be evaluated and revised on an on-going basis.

Comments from the committee:

- Consider limiting how many sections a single faculty member could teach in order to keep the quality of instruction high.
- Departments should help students understand the importance of quality writing in their future careers so that they are motivated to work on their writing.
- Enthusiastic support for the program from several members – the program seems like it will benefit the students and we want to teach these courses too! We would like to see the university appropriately support the professional development aspects of the program.
- EPC will suggest revision of the MCCC to indicate courses that replace the WEPT.
- The program requires high quality faculty who can put in the extra effort – especially relevant for everyone whose disciplines are not writing. However, the current hiring

salaries do not necessarily support the hiring of candidates who would be able to do this work.

## **B. CALS Amendment to Teacher Preparation Track**

LW explained that the original proposal passed EPC in 2012. Part of today's decision is whether we can accept the amendment or it needs to go up through the Senate.

Patricia Kim-Rajal (PKR) explained the amendment, making the following points:

- The amendment only affects the teacher preparation track in CALS.
- The side-by-side table in the proposal that compares the old program with the proposed revisions did not match the narrative description. The table erroneously showed an extra 29 units in the teacher preparation track.
- CALS would like to modify the table so that it is consistent with the narrative describing the changes. This correction is needed to fix the ARR.

Comments from the Committee

- RW commented that the program did what they needed to do at the time in terms of putting forward a proposal that was approved. The erroneous table was not noticed at several different levels of review. RW made the decision to bring it back to EPC, but his assessment is that it is a straightforward correction.
- MM added that she was a new member of EPC at the time of the original proposal. She remembers that it was originally a complicated proposal, and that EPC asked for the table. Thus, the earlier levels of review might not have seen the table.
- Committee members expressed appreciation for Rich's careful reading.
- It was noted that prior to the institution of side-by-side comparisons, EPC did approve narratives, so that it makes sense to go with the narrative.
- Today's proposal was reviewed by the Multiple Subject program, and that chair agrees that it is a simple correction with no implications for their program.

TWs moved that we approve the amendment to allow the side-by-side comparison be changed to match the narrative, without sending forward to the Senate. NR seconded. Unanimous approval.

Meeting adjourned at 12:55 pm

Minutes submitted by CB