



MINUTES

TO: Educational Policies and Programs Committee
FROM: Nik Janos, Secretary
DATE: February 5, 2015
SUBJ: EPPC MINUTES – February 5, 2015, Kendall Hall room 207, 2:30 p.m.

Members present: Boyd, Donoho, Ford, Janos, Kaiser, McConkey (Schindler), Nichols, Roll (Ellingson), Rowberg, Schierenbeck, Thompson (Lee), Kemper, Postma, Loker, Trethewey, Aird, Leeds, Herren, Kapoor.

Call to order 2:34 p.m.

1. Approve **minutes** of November 20, 2014 meeting
 - a. Approved with no changes.

2. Approve today's **agenda**
 - a. Add other "SB386 & Course Match."
 - b. Approved as amended above.

3. Announcements
 - a. School of social work: largest graduate program on campus. Large graduating class. Every year we do a culminating event, social justice speaker. Special ceremony. We had the PAC reserved but it was kicked out by Facilities. May not have a facility to hold our event. We've been told we don't have a facility. We have 80 graduating seniors, many whom are first generation college students. What strategies can we get this resolved? This year? Next year? Questions: what about other options. Social work "We've been told no." Reason is because only 10-12 programs that get special space. We have been told no other program can have space. Suggestion: make noise with the students about this denial. Student rep: BMU is there. Can't make promise but I can see. You might have to pay. Look into it. Discussion of cost of BMU. Why can't students use the BMU for free? Chair: may need to move this to "other" to have fuller discussion.

- b. Biology seminar by friends of the herbarium. Talk on biodiversity in the tropics.
- c. NorCal honor band and choir on campus this weekend. Be friendly to high school students.
- d. Herren: Introduce student representative Ari. He will be joining us the rest of the semester. Chair: we have room for 3 student representatives.
- e. College of Ag is hosting a career fair at the CSU farm. February 18 10-2pm. Several individuals and companies looking for applicants.

4. Chair's Prerogative

a. President's Spring Convocation & WASC – Discussion

- Chair: Homework was to attend. WASC is coming to town. Chair has some specific questions. What is our role? Who wants to share previous experiences? We've been on a 10 year good record. What to expect? Curriculum assessment.
- Senator: I found it extremely disappointing and superficial. They didn't talk to use. And I thought this is WASC. I thought they would ask relevant question about the curriculum but I found they were not knowledgeable about our curriculum.
- Senator: Consensus that it was the students that "kicked the ball over the field goal."
- Loker: went to WASC workshop last week. "Meaning, quality, and integrity of degree." They are interested in seeing that our students have a BA level knowledge of critical areas, speaking, writing, critical thinking, (5 core competencies) and they will be looking at that in all programs. They want to see 100% of students in programs meeting these goals.
- Chair: for new faculty going through WASC for first time, where are resources they can learn more about WASC visit.
- Loker: all material from previous visit in on the Provost website. Process has changed. Not two visits, only one. We will create and Institutional proposal that is due 2017. WASC will give us feedback on that and come back in 2019 to see that we meet the proposal. WASC has a website.
- Senator: I agree with the list Loker mentioned but one concern I have is that in the sciences it is hard to meet the core competencies in four years with a full unit expectations.
- Dean: So does every program have to meet all five learning outcomes? (answer yes) though quantitative reasoning is not expected in all programs.

- Loker: real issue is how programs set the bar. This is part of a larger national discussion about what the meaning of a BA is. Campuses are not required to follow the national standards. Campuses set their standards.
- Senator: with out faculty and without money we can't meet the requirements.
- Chair: What is the diagram or flow chart of how WASC visit works. What are the individual roles of the departments and faculty members?
- Loker: the was a committee that was formed. No VPs on the committee but some reported to VPs. Arno chaired the committee. Chair of academic senate. Below that were several subcommittees. WASC has certain expectations and certain things we wanted to highlight to WASC. We felt that each institution is distinct. We put for first year experiences, counteracting drug and alcohol culture, GE, and a few others. Faculty got involved in subcommittees that drafted reports that made it into Institutional Proposal. We pointed out several strengths and weaknesses (funding for example). Issues related to GE. Party culture, didn't make good strides but the issue was something we were still working on. WASC then says we will come back to check on these things. A ten-year review was a testament to our work.
- Chair: Sub-committees are populated by faculty/staff? (Answer Yes and some students but not a lot. Website has list of all faculty).
- Senator: how many faculty got release time to do all of this work.
- Chair: what happened at the dept. level?
- Senator: there were a couple of WASC people in suits.
- Loker: Focus of WASC is student learning.

b. Interdisciplinary Learning Group Senate Retreat – Discussion

- Chair: we had quite a group. How many were there? Three people. What specific items came to mind that EPPC could move forward? Some solutions proposed and some suggestions proposed.
- Senator: Challenges for interdisciplinary team teaching. You have to figure in FTES, workload, especially if in different colleges. There are other institutions doing this kind of work. What can we learn from them. We can learn about this concept because right now we are not. Right now it is discourage by RTP process to do interdisciplinary work. Challenges: honors program has tried to do interdisciplinary but found it hard because of burdensome instructor time requirements to coordinate it. Maybe we need to break apart RTP and revisit how RTP fits into the 21st century. How do you house interdisciplinary work? In one college? IN another? Or maybe we need a university wide place to house it.
- Senator: another barrier is that there is not space on campus for faculty to meet and get together. Need a space.

- TLP: it was fascinating all the great ideas but frustrating because some university structure prohibited all the great ideas. People were settling for something way less than imagined. It became fatalistic. "We'll never be able to do that."
- Senator: I don't understand how interdisciplinary collaboration is prohibited by RTP. It doesn't say in FPPP or departmental policies that say you can't do that.
- Direct response, Dean: Both at dept. level what kinds of scholarship counts and what kind of scholarship outside of traditional canon count. That is why we thought maybe we need a university RTP committee.
- Direct response, Senator: thumbs down, negative.
- Dean: need to create culture that values interdisciplinary work. It is required of us as we move into the future of the academy.
- Senator: There was a issue in Chemistry (this comment drew disagreement with another senator who said it wasn't true).
- Direct response, I know that is the rumor about science education but I don't believe that is the truth. I remember when we had a university personnel committee but it only imposed new standards on the colleges. No one was happy about that. There is nothing in the RTP standards that prohibits interdisciplinary. Needs to change at the department level. Don't want to lose that.
- Senator: I have a nice working relationship with someone in recreation management. Her work is not valued in her department but my contribution is valued.
- Chair: Interjection: focus on what EPPC can do. Do we want to create a subcommittee? An EM? A resolution?
- Loker: RTP still states that people can demonstrate contribution to university strategic plan. Maybe make it part of university strategic plan.
- Senator: when we had a university RTP it was a slaughter. One person would give a 0 one would give a 6. Totally uneven. It should be about changing department culture. We shouldn't do a resolution. I don't think every department wants to march to the drum of interdisciplinary. But we can help change the component to recognized the value of interdisciplinary work.
- Senator: there are barriers but there are ways we can move beyond them.
- Senator: if interdisciplinary teaching comes to benefit students, then we can help train the old folks that want to protect their fiefdoms, we can change attitudes. We can train in RTP with eye for interdisciplinary work.
- Chair: Faculty Affairs is hosting RTP workshops for departments.
- Senator: one other area that might be helpful is funding. CELT is very supportive of joint projects but RESP is discouraging of joint projects.
- Senator: our role is furthering curriculum development; our role might be to work on the curriculum benefits of interdisciplinary work.

- Chair: please contact me with your ideas. We are governing curriculum as EPPC but doesn't preclude EPPC members from working on RTP issues that report to the larger senate and FASP. A RTP proposal group would be beneficial. There are specific avenues to take. Contact me with names, including yourself. I will be meeting with the interim provost and she is really interested in this and has interdisciplinary background.

c. Curriculum Services Update (Loker)

- Chair: crucial and vital role we play here in EPPC. When proposals and changes come out of departments they go through Curriculum Services. I want you to know what is going on with that. Dean Loker will explain and update.
- Loker: I am the current go to person. Kara left for another opportunity. She was excellent at the job. I have lots of respect. The job is currently open. We are looking for someone. The system is still in place. Someone will be hired to do this job. There will be a rough patch while no one fulfills that position. I am trying to avoid delays. If a project falls through the cracks let me know.

5. California Community College Proposed Bachelor's Degree Programs (Loker) – **Discussion Item**

- Chair: Final document being sent to Chancellor. Memo explains what is happening and there are links for more information. Needs to be addressed by February 10. We are not looking for courses that match community college. You should see courses that match up. What we are looking for is "degree program" that matches something at this university. That is what we should be concerned about. Get those prospective matches to department Chairs and EPPC Chair, Dean Loker, and Senate Chair.
- Loker: Two-track process is going on. I sent this information to college Deans. Asked for their response by February 10. We need to determine the degree of duplication. There are whole colleges that are not affected (e.g. HFA). There is potential for duplication of effort. We should error on the side of caution. If people have reasonable belief that there is a significant duplication of program we should put that in the spreadsheet. We are in the process of collecting data. I appreciate your work in speaking with faculty.
- Senator: GDAC (?): community college senators were shocked. It was a fast turnaround. It usually takes a year to turn around curriculum. Dental hygiene and mortuary services are off the table. We are not going to offer

them. We are not determining the equivalences between community BA and a CSU BA for entrance for graduate program. All leadership thinks this is about technical jobs.

- Senator: nursing has been contacted by Shasta on Health Management. We're holding back because I'm digging through some of this. Shasta says there is some duplication. I have the proposal from Shasta. It lists how many jobs are protected. It has some of the curriculum. They have their courses written; they didn't send them to us. I will write a letter support but I am hesitant. I need help on where to go. I don't want to support something that will impact our students.
- Loker: I don't think we should write any letters of support until the review is over. Hold off on that. Error on the side of caution.
- Dean, what happens next?
- Loker: review of feedback at chancellor's office. Someone will have to sort this out.
- Senator from business: Automotive management track seems technical to start with and then they have an entrepreneurial track. But we teach all those things. The first track is technical but then the other track is all in business. These students would have a business degree.
- Loker: keep in mind we sending more than just a spreadsheet of checkmarks. We will send justification regarding duplication. What you should do is take this to Chair of dept., and Deans or just bring this up to faculty who teach the courses. Bring it back to us.
- Chair: I would suggest that if you see a glaring similarity keep everyone in the loop by CCing Paula Sylvester, the Chair of the dept, and associated Dean.
- Senator: Chancellor wants each campus to make their specific comments.

6. Writing Instruction at CSU, Chico (Nichols) – **Discussion Item**

- Nichols: I'm not here to moan and groan but here to present the group issues that I've come across in my work as Chair of CAB. It is a big issue. 12 slide presentation. Writing key focus at CSU Chico. We cap writing course at 30 students. We have a university writing committee, which is unique for learning objectives. We have writing in the GE learning objectives. Why should we care? WASC cares. Writing is WASC core competency. Lack of writing proficiency = loss of job prospects. Here is some data. Concerns: data on the averages of papers written at different page lengths. We have focus on writing but we do less writing than other CSU campuses. Students need 4 courses with Writing Intensive to graduate. WI courses are full. But we have overlapping non-WI courses that have the same number, which are confusing. HFA carries the burden of WI courses. In 2012-13 we carried out an assessment and found

encouraging trends but we need to figure out the criteria for WASC. GE website has list of what “good writing instruction” looks like. Other concerns: money! WI is more expensive. The funding model doesn’t care. Big picture: amount of writing, availability of WI/C GE courses, confusion between different sections of same course, assessment, and finally money.

- Chair: it is the duty of senate representatives to update us on their activities.
- Senator: One of the things we’ve done in Nursing. We have 40 students, so we can’t split, so we give one extra unit WTU for 40 students. It has to go to the Dean every year. We need those other two extra classes. They are still not good writers when they come to me. WE need to work on teaching people how to write.
- Senator: I teach in Education field. I teach a Writing Intensive but it is not designated that way. Even with 30 or 35 I have 7-10 page papers. Even that I keep being asked to teach more than one section but I can’t because of workload. There has got to be TAs for some of these classes.
- Nichols: we wrote the EM that said support for WI should be there (TAs etc.).
- Chris Fosen: we are putting together documents on best practices on writing. I can answer any questions. One idea is making WI four credits not three.
- Senator: Seeing some workshops on teaching WI courses would be helpful. I have a concern with TAs. People have different ideas. So grading is an issue. I don't know how TA would work for everyone.
- Loker: This year our former Provost provides support for GE WI writing instruction.
- Kate: this is something that is discussed in faculty support. Please keep us informed.
- Senator: HFA takes a big load of WI. But they don’t get the financial support. This hurts the college. We got some support because of Dean fought for support and we temporarily got it from the former Provost.
- Chair: What can EPPC do to work on solutions? Should this be a discussion item on a future agenda?
- Senator: Everyone has an idea of what should be the writing requirement. Could we have a sequential writing course so we can see the improvement? That could be a better way to quantitatively show improvement for WASC.
- Senator: I would like a writing workshop on WI.
- Chair: Interjection: can Kaiser send note on SB386.
- Kaiser: the law says any student can enter your online course. Workload issues. I will send a note on this.
- Loker: can we make SB386part of the next agenda? (Chair: yes).

- TLP: why don't lower division instructors don't require higher writing proficiencies. Seems like there is lost opportunity at lower division.
- Direct response: because of huge class sizes.
- Senator: 85% get As or B+ in lower division writing courses. So that is the expectation of students.

7. Other

- Chair: motion to move SB386 to next agenda. I had a couple of things. Our ombudsperson EM was dusted off. An ad hoc committee is coming together to reopen that EM. Special prefixes are an issue for a few reasons. We have to address that. I am bringing this up as a discussion item and looking to form a conversation on that.
- Discussion of SB386 and Course Match moved to next meeting.
- Loker: what about Social Work issue with recognition ceremony. Take it up with your Dean.
- Senator: it has been to our Dean.
- Senator: Nursing has been on that list up and down the chain. Facilities has the power to change that at any time.
- Chair: the memo says any request during the week of May 11-15 will be denied by facilities.
- Herren: on my behalf I am working to see what options are possible and find you answers.
- Senator: didn't we just finish an EM on graduation?
- Chair: we finished a commencement EM.
- Senator: problem is that if it is not considered commencement then it will be denied.
- Chair: there is no mention in the EM about facilities.

8. Adjournment: 4:23pm