

## **EPC Minutes - December 1, 2016**

**Fall 2016 Meetings of EPC:** (Academic Affairs Conference Room, ST 1040)

### **ALL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

MM Melinda Milligan, Chair (SOCI)  
BT Briana Taggart (AS)  
JP John Palmer (MUS)  
CB Chiara Bacigalupa (EDU)  
KC Kathryn Chang (BUS)  
LG Luisa Grossi (ART)  
JL Jenn Lillig (CHEM)  
AN Alvin Nguyen (SYE)  
PJ Pat Jackson (CCJS)  
TW Tia Watts (CS)

### **MEMBERS (CONT.)**

KMo Karen Moranski  
AW Andy Wallace (PHIL)

### **Guests:**

KMu Katie Musick  
MG Michela Grobbel  
RW Richard Witcus  
RL Reyna Laney  
KT Karen Thompson  
GM Greg Milton  
LM Laurel McCabe  
AB Alexis Boutin

### **Call to Order 11:02**

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes from 11/10/16

### **Changes of Agenda:**

Added 3<sup>rd</sup> consent item: GEP 206

Agenda approved with addition of time certain and GEP 206

### **Reports**

#### **1. Chair of EPC —M. Milligan**

-The senate agenda; the MPA program and interim GEP items are on the consent agenda.

-The probation policy we approved is on the senate for a first reading

-Senate hearing for proposed water program discontinuance. EPC may want to look at the discontinuance policy. AW said that he supported a campus discontinuance-suspension policy. KMo said they are trying to find the existing policy.

- Justin Lipp (Faculty Center Director) contacted MM to alert her to a forthcoming call for online course development and to confirm he understood the campus procedure for proposal of online courses. We have a policy that an online course can be taught online, hybrid, or face-to-face based on the decision of the department. Our existing MCCCCF doesn't have an indicator of whether a course is online, hybrid, or face to face, so one needs to be added. Justin needs to make sure the department is told that they must propose this and use an MCCCCF form to categorize the type of course being taught. MM reported she told Justin that, after the call is issued, it would be appropriate for EPC, in conjunction with Justin, to remind departments to review the online course policy, especially that the policy encourages them to develop their own departmental policy. AW asks what LD/UD GE bottleneck courses would be affected. KMo said they were

mostly UD GE courses. AW mentioned that he teaches online courses and notes the lack of support for technical problems that students have, and students get no support. MM says that is in direct contradiction to the campus policy. MM says that when the MCCFs come forward we can deal with it for now, but the policy itself needs to deal with it.

### **Consent Items**

1. Various Non-GE MCCCfS – approved by consent.
2. SCI 220 (GE Area E, 3 units, Permanent) – approved by consent.
3. GEP 206 (GE Area D2, 3 units, Permanent) – approved by consent.

### **Old Business**

1. SSCI 320, 2<sup>nd</sup> reading

MM asks if we can approve this. Dean Wingard has submitted a revised justification (see Moodle document) that the purpose of SSCI 320 is to create a category for courses that apply to the school and not to departments. PJ moves to approve the course. AW seconds. Motion approved.

2. ITDS (Minor, BA, BS, MA, MS) (Revision to Existing Program) (L. McCabe, A. Boutin), **TC 11:15**

MG discussed the 30 unit prerequisites for the degree and felt it would be unfair to entering students. RW says they were trying to make a high bar for the program. RW says it will be up to each individual program to decide what to do. TW says the plan is to get rid of the student designed program. TW says they came up with some good things. RW said we got rid of it because many of the students failed or did not do well. JL raised question of whether a faculty member could still do it. KMo says you can look at it as an incubator for new models, a place where the German Cultural Studies major can grow.

JP asked what the timeline is to get a new program up and going? KMo says it's 18-36 months. MM says that's at the CSU level. The existing proposal is to avoid that problem. MG says it takes a year in her department. AB says this would be driven by the faculty, who would have more of a role in developing and sustaining it. TW's understanding was that a student program would be housed in ITDS. AB says the max time is 5 years in ITDS, then it has to go elsewhere. LM says that there's been a titanic shift in ITDS thinking. MM Can we decide what to do since this is a second reading? Can the two representatives of the proposal to go back and bring them back to EPC to our next meeting? MM asks if everyone can go back and return to talk about the undergrad issue. Thus, MM is extended the second reading to the next EPC reading.

### **New Business**

1. ITDS - German Cultural Studies Major (Revision to Existing Program) (M. Grobbel) **TC 12:00**

MG presents changes in the ITDS - German Cultural Studies Major. These changes were triggered by elimination of all lab units in the first and second years. MG added two more classes and revised things. The important changes:

the 42 core major courses. I also added elective courses, now I'm calling them major elective courses. The load of units is changed for the major and general electives. She then made changes in adding the two-unit internship.

TW asked why language units were dropped and MG indicated SSU one of only two CSU schools with 5 unit language courses, and we were encouraged to teach 4 unit courses plus they had not been compensated for teaching the five unit courses. MM asks whether any changes will require an MCCS and MG indicates none. Unit changes you've discussed? MG No. JN asks if students taking the POLS classes 307/350 are aware of prerequisites to get in and MG says yes.

PJ motioned to waive the 1<sup>st</sup>, JP seconded. MM Discussion? Unanimously waived 1<sup>st</sup> reading. Second reading.

TW thinks we need to know how this needs to be laid out. How are faculty being compensated for load? CB noted the concern about load and the incubator model. Someone said this should be discussed with respect to all proposals, not just this one.

AW The total units required is exactly the same, they're just being redistributed? MG says yes.

TW requests that MG detail her uncompensated workload as a matter of record. It is agreed that this info would be useful, but that it is not needed to make a decision on the current proposal. It is requested that MG provide this info by email to MM. Motion is made to approve proposal, but with MG asked to provide summary of her uncompensated workload associated with the German Cultural Studies major. AW moved to approve. JP seconded. Unanimously approved.

## **2. Educational Leadership (Revision to Existing Program) (V. Montera) TC 12:15**

VM reviewed one page summary of their proposal. This is driven by the credentialing authority. This change is for the preliminary principal credential. It's also for their Master's students. The proposal increases the unit load by two units.

VM talked the committee through the proposal outline. Most of the changes are in the substance in the courses. PP 583 on law requires knowledge about budgets and they added resource allocation. VM 588 is about instructional leadership and expands it to curricular leadership and assessment of program. PP 589 is about leadership with respect to diversity. We integrate diversity and privilege issues here. VM 584 on school leadership; the state wants principals involved in resource outside of school resources.

MM Could you speak to the resource issues here? VM For the school it will affect faculty workload. For students, if they're full-time it won't affect cost but if they're part-time it will. PP says that there are 1-2 students per year affected.

AW asks why do they take these courses. PP They're wanting to be administrators and need this credential?

JN Is there a need for the before after impact? VM says it's all on the proposal. We know.

JN moves to waive 1<sup>st</sup> reading. TW seconds. AW moves to approve. KS 2nds the motion. Unanimously approved.

3. Business Administration BA (Revision to Existing Program) (K. Thompson)  
TC 11:30

MM We've already determined that this is a revision of an existing proposal. Explain what is happening. KT says extended education approached us to tell us that we could expand our program to community colleges. We have to maintain our accreditation while doing this. GM adds that extended education's portion is to provide the mechanism to support the extension. MM asks if KT wanted to add anything. KM says there is precedent, such as Ukiah, a completion program offered off-site. It would be similar to the Ukiah program, a bachelor's degree offered. JL asks if this is a situation where faculty would be teaching on an overload? GM says it's either a SSU faculty member doing an overload but occasionally we hire an adjunct. To meet the accreditation requirements it will mostly be current faculty doing overloads; 50% of courses have to be taught by tenure track faculty for accreditation to be maintained. It could also be a course release and a replacement with adjunct. CB asks if students pay extended education or SSU fees, and it's more expensive to do extended education approach, raising an equity issue. Response is that they pay ExEd fees, which are higher, but allow students to attend who can't otherwise make it to the SSU campus. MM asks what do you mean by SSU faculty? Any lecturer? KT says they have to be Ph.D. holding faculty in the tenure track.

JL says this is evenings and Saturdays. This is night? They're going to be driving? These faculty aren't here then for our students? The students are not SSU students. TW's concern is that would be challenging to teach an overload, and we seem to be talking a lot about faculty doing a lot of overload. TW wonders if they can create an online presence for these students rather than a whole new program and travelling everywhere? KT says they feel face-to-face is a better way to teach, maybe it could be a hybrid course. MM asks if any courses would be online? KT says only in summer.

AW asks how students are going to meet their other requirements to get their SSU degree. KT says they'll be typical transfer students. By the time they get to our program they'll need to do the 60 units of business courses. KT says to go to the second page of their proposal, including 9 units UD GE plus 44 units of business courses, plus 7 units of electives. GM says this is all planned here through summer as they do for Liberal Studies. AW, the second part of his question: how many students? GM says 20-30 students but they don't have a statistical survey yet. College of Marin, our first site, says it could be 5-10 moving directly from their AA degree. SRJC, Marin, Solano will also provide the students.

MM asks why this program isn't being done stateside, noting that there is a Liberal Studies model through ExEd (Napa Valley and Solano) and also Liberal Studies stateside (Ukiah), and questioned why the business school chose ExEd? GM says the stateside program is a legacy. GM says we have the ability to provide the admin support that isn't necessarily true for stateside programs. MM asks KT whether it could handle the admin side and she didn't think so.

JN notes the challenge of teaching a Saturday class. Twenty-six faculty are in the school of business, but it will take 6 people per semester to staff this extension. JN asks whether any of those faculty have taught evenings and Saturdays. KT says they do because of the current EMBA program. JP says people may get tired of doing it.

PJ asks how this works with RTP review. How are these courses going to mesh with RTP, with or without a course release?

MM to KT: For the second reading, discuss RTP procedures and how they work with this model and why the stateside model won't work. Others wanted staffing addressed. Someone asked if they could do a survey of business faculty to find out how much interest there is in teaching in this program. Another concern expressed was the risk they're putting themselves in if they can't staff classes. MM wants to know who is advising these students. You should confer with the union if you're going to replace faculty with paid advisors at the JC. AW argues that these students are going to pay more than SSU students, an equity issue. And MM notes SEIE programs are not allowed to supplant regular classes.

4. New Degree Proposal: Geography, Environment, and Planning (GEP) (R. Laney) **TC 12:30**

-RL describes this as the front and center of the merge of the two departments. The curriculum is a true integration of courses from both departments. The question was how to rearrange the structure to meet the needs of students. RL indicated they discussed workload, GE requirements, what we can actually teach, etc., and we think that this curriculum is going to work in all of these aspects. This is a first go around with this curriculum, and we're getting a new hire and expect to add courses to the curriculum. So we expect to be back to fine tune.

MM: Keep in mind this is a brand new degree program, not a revision, so no need to compare to 2017-18 versions of majors to be discontinued should GEP go forward.

TW asks what proportion of students took courses in ENSP and vice versa. RL says it varies. Planning did not have much crossover, but conservation and resources people would take a lot of the courses across departments. TW student feedback? RL students are mixed, some are clear and others who don't understand the change are confused.

JN: In the new department there will be 5 concentrations? RL: for Fall 2018, the current proposal is for a new BA. The BS program will be revised in the future. KM notes that this has been carefully planned. AW comments positively on the work that they've done. AW asks RL to explain specific aspects of the degree requirements.

MM people should look at this proposal for our second reading on Dec. 15<sup>th</sup>.

Meeting adjourns 12:54 PM