

**Educational Policies Committee
Meeting Minutes**

Wednesday, November 2, 2022

Status of Minutes: Approved 11/16/22

Attendees

Members Present: L. Becker, J. DeBonis, S. Garrett, K. Grote, L. Marcal, Y. Mimura,
K. Taylor, D. Weingarten

Members Absent: J. Anderson, T. Montañó, T. Zirakian

Staff: D. Cours, R. Guerra, K. Harris, J. Hunter

Guests: J. Auerbach, K. Baxter, K. Dabbour, N. Dermendjian, L. Domine,
R. Espinoza, M. Gammage, S.J. Gandhi, A. Glocke, J. Henry,
V. Jensen, X. Jia, J. Kim, P. Lazarony, K. Stanford, B. Wu, N. Zappia

I. Announcements

A. There were no announcements.

II. Business

A. The minutes from 10/19/2022 were **MSP approved**.

B. K. Grote said that the B5 subcommittee had a very productive meeting to discuss goals to work toward. The subcommittee pulled previously approved B5 courses to review. The subcommittee hopes to create a more transparent process for proposing courses in Section B5 and to develop a flowchart or rubric. A more extensive update will be provided at the next meeting.

C. D. Weingarten asked members for their thoughts and concerns regarding the proposed academic calendars. He explained that the overall constraints, as well as the timing of winter session, do not allow for much flexibility in changes to the calendar. Members were invited to email him directly with feedback for the Academic Calendar Committee.

D. Mike Curb College of Arts, Media, and Communication

Art

Memo

1. Art Education Minor. **MSP approved**.

Theatre

Course Modifications

2. TH 208A – Acting II: Character and Text (2). **MSP approved**.

3. TH 442M – Advanced Theatre Movement (2). **MSP approved**.

Program Modifications

4. Theatre, B.A. **MSP approved.**
5. Minor in Theatre: Acting/Directing. **MSP approved.**

E. College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

Africana Studies

New Course

1. AFRS 362 – Diversity and Public Policy (3). **MSP approved** with correction to SLOs to match the form and syllabus.

Criminology and Justice Studies

Course Modification

2. CJS 370 – Criminal Justice Systems (3). **MSP approved** with update to syllabus (change Moodle references to Canvas).

Program Modification

3. Criminology and Justice Studies, B.A. **MSP approved.**

History

New Course

(Returning from 9/7/22)

4. HIST 202 – Critical Thinking in History (3). **MSP approved** with revised course title *Critical Thinking in California History* and updated short title to match. Update syllabus with dates or acknowledgment of slavery and indigenous peoples.

New Course

5. HIST 418 – Environmental History of North America (3). **MSP approved** with revised course description and clarification of SLOs addressed on the matrix.

F. College of Engineering and Computer Science

Civil Engineering and Construction Management

(Returning from 10/19/22)

New Courses

1. CE 240L – Engineering Statics Lab (1). **Tabled** for revisions to the syllabus for the revised units, contact hours, meeting times, and grading for the linked lecture and lab. Check requirement or elective in another program on the proposal form.
2. CE 340L – Strength of Materials Lab (1). **Tabled** for revisions to the syllabus for the revised units, contact hours, meeting times, and grading for the linked lecture and lab. Check requirement or elective in another program on the proposal form.

Course Modifications

3. CE 240 – Engineering Statics (3). **Tabled** for revisions to the syllabus for the revised units, contact hours, meeting times, and grading for the linked lecture and lab. Check requirement or elective in another program on the proposal form.
4. CE 340 – Strength of Materials (3). **Tabled** for revisions to the syllabus for the revised units, contact hours, meeting times, and grading for the linked lecture and lab. Check requirement or elective in another program on the proposal form.

Program Modification

5. Civil Engineering, B.S. **Tabled**, related to CE 240L and CE 340L.

- G. W. Garrow read the committee charge and explained the role of the Senate Executive Committee liaison.

- H. D. Weingarten said that the draft AB 928 resolution from A. Swenson circulated at the last EPC meeting was unanimously passed by the Faculty Senate. D. Cours asked if the CSU Statewide Academic Senate was supposed to distribute the cumulative AB 928 feedback. D. Weingarten said he would ask A. Swenson.

- I. D. Cours asked for feedback on the proposed edits to the GVAR policy. She reminded the committee that the policy recommendation cannot be voted on until the related English course proposal is submitted to EPC in Spring 2023. The course will need to be granted early implementation to be in place with the updated GVAR policy for Fall 2023. Committee members had no additional feedback at this time.

- J. Standard Operating Procedure Updates
 1. Members discussed the proposed revisions to the consultation guidelines, which give departments the opportunity to provide an optional letter of support or non-concurrence. The revised Guidelines for Curricular Consultation were **MSP approved** (see Attachment I).
 2. Members discussed revising the Standard Operating Procedures to include a memo process for updating program requirements to reflect nonsubstantive course number changes (e.g., deleting a non-GE course and replacing it with a GE version of the same course). Feedback will be incorporated into the draft revisions for the next meeting.

III. New Business

- A. D. Weingarten started a discussion on a broader approach to General Education. When proposing new GE courses, should departments answer questions such as: *Why this course now? Who does it serve? How does it help students?* He raised the issue that GE is expanding rapidly and asked if there should be a plan for a more comprehensive vision of GE, given the recent changes due to EO 1100/R and the eventual changes from AB 928. Should there be parameters beyond meeting the GE SLOs? Precedent does exist at CSUN, such as the former “one-in, one-out” rule imposed on EPC, which required departments to remove a course from GE in order to propose a new GE course. With over 500 offerings in GE, a concern was expressed that there may not be enough student demand to schedule all of the courses in light of declining enrollment.

Both Chico and Cal Poly Pomona were mentioned as having interesting and innovative GE programs.

D. Cours said that the Educational Resources Committee has been looking at a strategic model of budgeting that would be more flexible than budgets tied to FTES by student demand for seats in courses. She suggested thinking about how to make the curriculum attractive to students, such as offering paths, certificates or badges.

K. Harris said there needs to be some review of GE policy and EPC is that body. The hope is that departments are being innovative, introducing new courses and reviewing old courses that are no longer suited. A policy could be proposed on how to review existing GE courses as new ones come in.

Meeting adjourned at 4:26 p.m.

Attachment I: Guidelines for Curricular Consultation

The general purposes of consultation are to ensure that other departments and colleges around campus are aware of new and changed curriculum, to identify areas of overlap, to identify implications of curricular changes for other departments and colleges, and to simply make other units aware of new or changed offerings in areas that may be of interest.

When Consultation Should Occur

Any department or program authoring curriculum proposals (new courses, course modifications, new programs, and program modifications) should consult with other departments and colleges that may be interested and impacted in the curricular change. The bullet points below offer a range of reasons why another department or college should be consulted. If any of these apply, consultation is required:

- Proposing a curricular change that utilizes another department's course or that affects enrollment in another department's course. Many majors and minors include other department's courses in their required or elective offerings. If a program is adding or deleting one of those courses from their electives, for instance, consultation with that outside program is required.
- Overlap. It is common for course offerings to have some overlap with other department's course offerings. If there is overlap either with particular courses or with the general disciplinary area of another department, consultation is required.
- GE courses. GE courses typically require more consultation for both of the reasons listed above. By definition, there tends to be more overlap with other program's offerings and there tends to be a greater chance of enrollment and other resource implications. Wider consultation is typically required in these cases.

How Consultation Should Occur

Consultation should always be conducted between department chairs (or, if it is not a department, program coordinators) or between associate deans. When a department proposing a curricular change seeks consultation, the chair of that department should send the proposal (via email) to all department chairs for which consultation is required. Consultation should occur as early as possible but at least by the time the proposal is finalized by the department proposing it. In general, chairs should give other chairs at least two weeks to respond to a request for consultation. Departments may choose to provide an optional letter of support or non-concurrence. The letter will be attached to the proposal as supporting documentation prior to EPC review. If there is no response, additional outreach should be done. If a department fails to respond entirely, the consult should be changed to "No Response" and EPC will treat this as concurrence.

Consultation Is Not a Veto

The response to a request for consultation should be listed officially as "Yes" if they concur, or "No" if they do not concur, or "In-Progress" if the consultation is still in progress. While that is the response listed on the form, the purpose of consultation is to identify opportunities and problems, to open up dialogue where there are problems or conflicts or problematic resource implications, and to seek to resolve any issues that arise before the proposal comes to EPC. If a department or college ultimately declines to concur on a proposal, the non-concurrence is not a veto of the proposal. EPC will be interested to understand the issues that came up and what the remaining objections are and will take that into account in making a decision on a proposal. The non-concurring department may choose to submit an optional letter providing additional context. The letter will be attached to the proposal as supporting documentation prior to EPC review. However, a letter of non-concurrence will not limit committee discussion, nor replace the department's opportunity to speak at EPC.