



MEMORANDUM

TO: Educational Policies and Programs Committee
FROM: Chiara Ferrari, Chair
DATE: September 13, 2018
SUBJ: EPPC MINUTES – September 13, 2018, Kendall Hall 207, 2:30 p.m.

Members present: Ford, Horst, Ferrari, Allen (proxy for Shepherd), Connolly, Kim, Adamian, Watkins, McConkey, Altfeld-Fisher, Hostetter-Lewis, Mitchell-Brown, Medic, Cooper, Bailey, Grassian, Vela (proxy for Hassenzahl), Maas, Hammer, Peterson, Akinwande

1. Approve minutes for August 30, 2018

The agenda was approved with the minor change that CAB rep from EPCC is no longer Rick Ford, it is Heather Altfeld.

2. Chiara introduced the Secretary Schedule for the EPCC meetings.

3. Chiara needs a vice-chair for the EPCC meetings. Mahalley Allen has volunteered to be Vice-Chair for EPCC.

4. A representative is needed on the University Writing Committee. Ana Medic has agreed to do this for Fall 2018 but issue will be revisited in January if necessary.

5. Sara Trechter (guest) presented on the Study Abroad Advisory Committee. Discussion of evaluating programs for faculty-led trips, exchange programs. This included a series of attachments that specified the 2018 SAAC report. Michelle McConkey inquired as to the scholarships available for study-abroad students, and this inspired other lines of inquiry about summer scholarships etc. Sara Trechter addressed these questions.

6. Introduction Item: Minor in Chicano Studies

Sara Cooper introduced the Intersectional Chicanx/Latinx Studies for the reason that it would parallel the B.A. in Intersectional Chicanx/Latinx studies. Mahalley asked if the B.A. was denied/delayed, would name change have to be revisited? Chiara spoke about her concern that outside of academia, the name of this minor (and thus, major) would be problematic for students in job applications, etc. and that the language was “quite a mouthful.” Sara spoke to the concern by saying that prospective employers in the U.S. are more aware of diversity of their applicants (as well as their clientele). Paul says that while

the country is not yet at the point of wholehearted acceptance, the language is future-forward. Annie concurred, stating that things will shift to the point where this language is “not a mouthful” with which Sam also agreed.

Chiara called for a vote and the proposal to change the title of the Minor passed unanimously.

7. Chiara introduced Paula Sylvester and Maris Thompson to address the subject of EPCC/Senate mentorship. Maris spoke about the difficulty of carrying a minority opinion with respect to the RTP process and how faculty do own the curriculum and do have the license to be critical, question, etc, addressing the reading of proposals through a series of questions presented in a handout regarding broad categorical breakdowns of description, quality, cost-effectiveness, program requirements, responsiveness to student needs, and consultation. She also discussed the fact that proposals that went on to the Senate that were not fully vetted became more clear as it was dissected in the Senate.

Paula talked about the weight of the position on EPCC and how important it is to understand the scope of roles as committee members. She suggested using the handout regularly in order to properly vet proposals. She talked about how important it is to speak out, even if it is stating the obvious, rather than being silent. The Senate depends on EPCC for a serious vetting process. Finally, she clarified that the role of EPCC members is also an elected role, meaning that members are responsible for their constituency and not just to their own opinions, and the importance of asking for additional context, history, etc. in order to make a more educated decision. Kyle Horst asked about discipline-specific knowledge and how to navigate this while in the first year and Chiara clarified that it is in part the diverse representation on the Senate that helps in this process. Mahalley discussed the tactic of taking notes before the meetings so that one arrives with some clear idea of what needs to be explained further before a vote is taken/opinion formed. Paula also discussed the fact that the Senate meetings are recorded, etc. and therefore is part of public record.

8. Colleen Milligan is introduced as a guest presenter from Anthropology with a proposed name change for the Certificate in Forensic Science. Colleen explained that there is currently an antiquated name for the Certificate (Forensic Identification) and this name is aligning more clearly with the current terminology for the field. Sara Cooper asked Colleen to clarify the SLO's for the name change, and Colleen explained that Forensic Science is a cross-disciplinary field and that the name actually is more clear in terms of the actual field and the disciplines involved. Colleen also explained that the Forensics coordinator is on maternity leave and that the precise wording of the proposal was not authored by her. She also explained that the certificate prioritizes upper-division legal/science writing for the purposes of documentation required in the field.

Daniel Grassian stated that he wishes the proposal had been more clear and in-depth with more context when brought to EPCC. He also asked about the history of the program on campus. Colleen explained that it began in the 1980's within the Department of

Anthropology. Daniel continued by asking about certificates as opposed to minors, with some confusion around the difference, and stated that it would be potentially possible to open certificates up to the community as well. An analogy was drawn between the data-science certificate. WASC will need to approve certificate programs as well. Rick Ford clarified that there is a ceiling for units in a minor, but not in a certificate.

Chiara presents the idea of voting on it as an introduction item or sending it back for revision. Sam stated that future forms really need to be more clear so that they do not return to this committee and drain on further resources.

Chiara called for a vote on the proposal for name change as an introduction item, and the proposal passes unanimously.

9. Steffan Mehl presented on the Civil Engineering program and explained some of the high requirements for students going through the program. The goal is in part to streamline graduation.

Daniel asked for clarification regarding the graduation streamlining and for the rationale behind the credit low/high range for graduation, with an additional follow up about courses being offered every semester. Daniel followed up by saying that the schedule for students seems extremely tight and that it is essential to not force students to take additional courses or raise the ceiling for units required. He talked about the dangers of having a high-unit major that has some ambiguity for the upper end of units slowing students down. Steffan explained that some exceptions are made in areas such as B-2 if students are transferring or have changed majors, therefore not requiring them to retake the B-2 class. Sam expressed concern at the complexity of the change, and Steffan clarified that the changes are supposed to help rather than hinder students from progressing to graduation status. Sara asked Steffan if library approval had been attained before the paperwork had been submitted and he clarified that he is in touch with Wendy Diamond about this matter. Steffan also discussed the structural engineering offered here in the context of other CSU's where there is more of a focus on environmental engineering. Mahalley asked for clarification about the statement of support from the dean as well as the library rep.

Mahalley asked also about the evidence of internal dissent in the department as presented in the proposal given to EPCC. Chiara said that she had asked Steffan to provide evidence that due process was followed and hence the memos attached were included to provide evidence. Steffan will have pertinent faculty (who signed the memo before) provide a date on the memorandum so that it is clearer to the EPCC/Senate. Sara asked for additional evidence of faculty consultation. Further discussion ensued about the proposal and how much documentation needed/did not need to be included. Chiara clarified the difference between the process itself and the proposal, and that she asked for the documentation specifically because it was proposal-related. The fact that the curriculum chair and the department chair are the same person (in this case, Mehl) is a question that requires a closer look.

Eddie Vela asked whether or not a proposal can be voted on if it has not been determined that the process was legitimately followed. Mehl pointed out that the memo was signed as an understanding of “conceptual” votes rather than the “real” vote.

Chiara stated that as chair she does not question the process now that she has seen the evidence. The vote is on whether or not EPCC approves the proposed significant changes.

Paul and Daniel would like to know the remedy for students who will be at the high end of this unit major because of course offerings, etc. Daniel said that he would like to see either a drop of two credits elsewhere, or evidence that no students would have to take four-credit classes.

Sara Cooper asked if these credit requirements are reflected in the catalog copy. Mehl states that the top limit is 129 units, Cooper expressed concern that this is actually a substantive catalog change.

Members of the EPCC then expressed concern about the accuracy of the numeric representation.

Chiara calls for a vote:

1 in favor
3 absentions
15 no's

10. Russell Shapiro presenting discontinuation proposal of Hydrogeology Cert.

Chair thanks Russell for following proper procedure. Suggests that at some point we should discuss, as a body, whether or not discontinuations follow the same procedures as full degree programs follow.

Russell stated that it does not appear that anyone has completed our Hydrogeology cert. There is another official Hydrogeology cert that is different than ours. It could be misleading to students because they could get our certification, but then they would possibly still not be qualified to get the official certificate due to lack of the required course work. He could not find a record of anyone completing the certificate. Russell shared that some graduates had come back and shared with him that they felt misled after later learning that our certificate did not have the value they thought it was sold to have.

Sara Cooper thanks Shapiro for coming with a clear and well-prepared proposal.

Chiara called for a vote to pass as both an intro item and an action item.

Sara moved to suspend rules and vote as action item. Michelle seconded.
Motion passes unanimously.

Motion to pass as action item: Vote passes unanimously.

11. Announcements

CFA Party at 5 today at Tres.

Sam shares that they are still missing representatives for students from HFA.
Send interested students to BMU 220G to get involved. (2.3 GPA Requirement)

12. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45pm.