

EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMITTEE:

<http://www.csun.edu/~epcugs/home.html>

Minutes of Meeting: November 05, 2003
Approved by Committee: **March 3, 2004**
Submitted to Executive Committee: _____
Approved by Executive Committee: _____
Submitted to Academic Senate: _____
Approved by Academic Senate: _____

Policies

MEMBERS PRESENT: D. Aiken (Student Rep.), A. Akers, J. Dow, M. Fieweger (Exec. Sec.),
H. Hertzog, M. Kamrava, J. Matos (Chair), J. Munsch, G. Truex
MEMBERS ABSENT: L. Lampert, M. Pardo, D. Schwartz
GUESTS PRESENT: Arlinda Eaton (EDU), Estelle Hekkers (A&R), Elliot McIntire
(S&BS), Elizabeth Say (HUM), Cynthia Rawitch (AMC)
STAFF: S. Loffler (Recording Secretary)

I. Announcements

A. This is the 6th EPC meeting of the 2003-2004 Academic Year.

Schedule of EPC 2003-2004 Meetings :

<u>FALL 2003</u>	<u>SPRING 2004</u>
September 10, 24	February 4, 18
<i>October 1 (special meeting: GE revision)</i>	
October 8, 22	March 3, 17
November 5, 19	April 14, 28
December 3, 17	May 12, 26

B. Lynn Lampert was absent.

C. The most recent Executive Order 595 (1992) which treats Title V was distributed to the members. Margaret Fieweger said that the document would also be distributed to the General Education Task Force with the hope that the Task force would be progressive and work toward changing the Order. CSUN should use an experimental approach to GE. Estelle Hekkers stated that GE Breadth courses are automatically programmed into DARS (Degree Audit Reporting System) with community colleges. Alyce Akers stated that there should be reciprocity and an articulation agreement between the CSU campuses as well. There should be conformity in the course numbering system such as that used in Florida. Margaret Fieweger asked that the EPC members that are elected to the General Education Task Force should look into Exec. Order 595. Then, Debra Aiken (AS Student Representative) announced her election to the GE Task Force. Three EPC members will be elected to the GE Task force.

D. Chair's report on Faculty Senate Executive Committee October 23, 2003 response to EPC's October 22, 2003 revised recommendation to approve a proposed process **to Revise General Education**. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee asked for a few minor editorial changes. The document that will go before the Faculty Senate is attached. (**Attachment 1**). Details of the changes are included here:

1. The two semi-paragraphs in item "1" have been reversed. The first sentence is as follows: "A task force will consider the goals and objectives of the GE program, review the evaluation of the current program found in the last WASC report, and develop an appropriate GE Program. The statement of objective (now the second paragraph) is as follows: "The process will include the objective of implementing "Recommendation 3" of the 2003 Graduation Rates Task Force Report, which states: "The total number of units in General Education (including Title V) will be reduced to 48 units."
2. The fifth bullet under item "2" was modified as follows: "The chair of the GE Task Force will be a faculty member elected by and from the members of the Task Force." Note: The second sentence, "If no one agrees to be nominated, then the Faculty President and Provost will appoint a chair from the elected members," was deleted.

- E. EPC members assigned to **Program Reviews** should contact Patty Faiman x2969 or email patty.faiman@csun.edu
- F. **CSUN Student Research Symposium:** November 21, 2003. Contact the Graduate Studies Office 677-2138 or email hedy.carpenter@csun.edu or katherine.g.bradford@csun.edu
- G. The **Class Scheduling Change discussion** (Item II.D, Time Certain: 3:15 p.m.) was postponed until the next meeting. A representative from the College of Business and Economics will speak to this topic.
- H. Mehran Kamrava announced he would not be at the next meeting.

II. Business

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. THE MINUTES OF October 1, 2003 were unanimously **approved**
2. MINUTES OF October 8, 2003 were unanimously **approved**
3. MINUTES OF October 22, 2003 (to be distributed)

- B. Arlinda Eaton opened discussion on the topic of whether EPC or GSC (Graduate Studies Committee) should review curriculum for the Credential Programs which have both 400 and 500 level courses. The committee asked why a post-baccalaureate program has 400 level courses. Arlinda Eaton said the program is now offered as a blended Credential post-baccalaureate and undergraduate program. An undergraduate can take 500 level courses. The Chair suggested that undergraduate courses should come to EPC regardless of the program to which they belong. Greg Truex suggested that undergraduate Program Modifications should come before the committee's review. It was suggested that the committee's Standard Operating Procedures be modified to clarify what programs and course levels should fall under EPC's purview.

It was
MSP by consensus to approve that EPC's Standard Operating Procedures (page 4) would be modified to clarify which programs and course levels are under EPC's purview.

The committee's Standard Operating Procedures are available on the EPC's website under "Downloadable Documents."

It was then suggested that the EPC and GSC have separate Standard Operating Procedures.

- C. Margaret Fieweger opened discussion of a photocopied document entitled, "Standards into Credit by Exam Policies," published by The College Board (mailed to members 8-21-2003). She stated that CSUN has not examined closely enough this opportunity to accelerate our lifelong learners students' time to graduation by offering them the option of testing out of courses. Estelle Hekkers stated that this practice was more prevalent in the 1970s (in San Diego State University and Arizona, for instance). At CSUN, we currently have only a few courses that allow Credit by Exam. When asked how the exam would be administered, Margaret Fieweger replied that students would visit the on-campus testing center. When asked why CSUN does not currently offer this option to students, Estelle Hekkers replied that there was disagreement among faculty about the accurate measuring of students' knowledge. Greg Truex stated that it seems wasteful not to offer this to students, especially in General Education where well-read students could be encouraged to test-out of courses. Estelle Hekkers stated that it is up to the Department Chair to decide. Margaret Fieweger said that this might be a discussion for the Department Chairs.
- Alyce Akers said she would like to see the exam content. The Chair said that this practice is probably already widespread on campus, but Margaret Fieweger said that students do not receive units for testing out. Estelle Hekkers said there is a maximum number of units that students can "CLEP-out" or test-out. Margaret stated that CLEP does not produce FTEs. Margaret then said that this topic of discussion would be shared with the Deans and Department Chairs and that she would take the topic to the next Provost Council.

The Chair then requested feedback from their discussion.

- D. **Time Certain: 3:15 p.m.** – At EPC's October 22, 2003 meeting, EPC members were asked to prepare comments and concerns on the impact of a proposed **Class Scheduling Change** to MW, TTh (1.5 hours) and Friday or Saturday (3 hours). This discussion was postponed until the next

meeting. A representative from the College of Business and Economics -which is already using the new schedule- will address the proposal's issues.

- E. Elliot McIntire raised issues on the format and content of the Curriculum forms (available at the "Downloadable Documents" Link on EPC website). He stated that the forms were too cluttered to understand and cumbersome to fill out. He distributed his suggested alternatives to the forms' layouts. Margaret Fieweger said that the forms are tools for implementation. It was suggested that the forms be created on a formatted spreadsheet. Sarah Loffler stated that a more user-friendly design would be applied to the curriculum forms.
- Elliot McIntire then asked where faculty could go to receive guidance in the sections on the forms that require information on Assessment and Learning Outcomes. Margaret Fieweger asked if the committee would like a taxonomy of Assessment Tools. Greg Truex stated that it would be better if there was a standard source. Margaret Fieweger agreed to ask CELT and Assessment to come up with a source.
- F. (This item was Item "G" on the agenda): **Retention of Student Work Policy**. William Watkins and Rafi Efrat will be invited to speak to the committee.
- G. (New Item added to Agenda). Margaret Fieweger asked the committee whether a moratorium should be placed on General Education courses. Our GE package is almost impossible to assess. Some departments are suggesting to students what it is they should take to help with their majors. Alyce Akers said that the "one-in/one-out" initiative was really not followed this year. Greg Truex said that the committee should accommodate modifications that improve GE but we should not have a moratorium because GE is already fossilized. Faculty could choose their students' GE according to their majors. Perhaps this question could be posed to the GETF. Margaret Fieweger said that 4 year and 6 year plans should include GE. What if everyone opt for one GE course? How does that impact the department? Currently, students try to complete their checklists to accommodate their schedules. Estelle Hekkers said that Pre-declared majors do use GE to decide upon a major. Alyce Akers said that GE should be an integrated foundation where the student integrates the information for himself. This integration should not be done *for* him. AMC Associate Dean Cynthia Rawitch said that all GE sections should be consistent. Margaret asked whether all lower division courses should be GE. Estelle Hekkers said that this was so in the 70s, where all but 2 courses in Sociology were used for GE. Margaret then suggested that we also look at the operating rule of limiting 6 courses per department for each section in GE. Greg Truex asked why GE isn't scrutinized more closely by Associate Deans before it gets to EPC. Margaret answered that by the time curriculum comes to EPC, it's gone through so many academic committee approvals that it becomes difficult to turn down the request. The Chair suggested that whenever EPC receives a new chair, the previous chair should accompany the new Chair at the Associate Deans' Curriculum meetings where curriculum is reviewed before it reaches EPC. The Chair suggested that these minutes be forwarded to GETF, once approved. Margaret then encouraged members to attend the GETF process meeting to be held in the Library Presentation Room at 2:00 p.m. on November 06, 2003.

III. Items Pending for 2003-2004

- A. Review Annual Report on Medical Withdrawals from Student Health Center
- B. Subcommittee for Online-Instruction Course Assessments - Discuss EPC's role in assessment for alternative delivery courses (e.g. online)
- C. Review of the Academic Calendar Proposed for the 2004-2005 Academic Year
- D. **New Curriculum Manual and Forms (SOLAR specific) will be distributed in late Spring 2004.**
- G. Process of Certification and Recertification of GE courses: postponed pending formation of GE-Taskforce.
- H. Pattern Modifications - Discuss allowing upper division GE courses to count in the GE pattern modifications listed on pages 44-45 in the catalog (Estelle Hekkers, A & R).

The meeting was adjourned at 3:53 p.m.

The next meeting is on November 19, 2003, in University Hall (UN) 211, 2:00-4:00 p.m.

Proposed process to revise General Education. (**Attachment on next page**)

(Attachment: Item I.D.)

This draft includes the suggested editorial modifications offered at the Executive Committee's October 23, 2003 meeting. **The proposal will go before the Faculty Senate on November 6**

Proposed process to revise General Education:

At its meeting on October 1, 2003, the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) unanimously approved a process for Reviewing General Education (GE). After consideration of suggestions from members of the Faculty Senate at their meeting of October 9, 2003, EPC modified the proposed process at its meeting on October 22, 2003. Further modifications were made at the October 23, 2003 meeting of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. The document reflects these changes.

EPC recommends the following process to the Faculty Senate:

- 1) **A task force will consider the goals and objectives of the GE program, review the evaluation of the current program found in the last WASC report, and develop an appropriate GE Program.**

The process will include the objective of implementing "Recommendation 3" of the 2003 Graduation Rates Task Force Report, which states: "The total number of units in General Education (including Title V) will be reduced to 48 units."
(Supporting reasons are attached to this document.)

- 2) **Using the following process, a GE Task Force will be formed to develop a plan for revising general education:**

- By December 5, 2003, the faculty of each college (AMC, B&E, ECS, EDU, HHD, HUM, SBS, S&M) and the Library will elect a representative to the GE Task Force.
- EPC will appoint three people from among the membership of EPC, with no more than one EPC member from any one college.
- Associated students will appoint a student member.
- The Provost will appoint a staff member who has advising responsibilities.
- The chair of the GE Task Force will be a faculty member elected by and from the members of the Task Force.
- The Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies will provide staff support and will serve as a non-voting member of the Task Force.

- 3) **The following are among the criteria to be used for the process:**

- The Task Force members will study current national theory and practice in general education and current requirements and practice within California higher education.
- All meetings of the Task Force will be open meetings.
- The Task Force will examine the learning outcomes of the general education program and revise as needed and will describe how the recommended program will achieve those outcomes.
- The Task Force will consult widely with the campus community. Specifically, the Task Force shall hold open hearings for faculty, staff, and students. After the Task Force has developed a preliminary plan, academic departments and colleges will be given an opportunity to provide written

comments. EPC and the Faculty Senate will be consulted regarding the preliminary plan and will identify issues they wish for the Task Force to address.

- The final report of the Task Force will include:
 - a. a statement of the goals and objectives of the GE Program
 - b. the recommended curriculum
 - c. a description of the process followed to develop these recommendations, *and*
 - d. a rationale that supports the recommendations and that addresses the concerns raised at the hearings and by the departments, colleges, and the Faculty Senate.

4) The GE Task Force will request of the Provost, in consultation with the Provost Council, a Two-Phase analysis of the fiscal impact of revising General Education.

First Phase:

The Deans and the Provost will examine the funding basis for the current general education program and will address resource implications for all departments.

Second Phase:

After the Task Force has developed a proposed general education plan, the Deans and the Provost will design a resource-allocation strategy for implementation of the new program. The implementation strategy will be forwarded to EPC and to the Senate as an addendum to the curricular proposal.

5) The proposed timeline

Fall 2003

- Target, criteria, process and timeline approved by EPC and Faculty Senate
- Task Force selected
- Phase I of fiscal analysis begins

Spring 2004

- Task Force begins its work
- Phase I of fiscal analysis completed and shared with campus community

Fall 2004

- Task Force completes its work
- Phase II of the fiscal analysis

Spring 2005

- **Review and approval by EPC and Faculty Senate**

Summary: This proposal would bring the CSUN general education program into alignment with the lower-division, transfer curriculum and would fulfill Title V requirements for general education.

SUPPORTING REASONS to APPROVE A PROCESS FOR REVIEWING GENERAL EDUCATION:

CSUN's GE/Title V program is the largest in the California State University system. CSUN's GE/Title V program totals 58 units. This includes 52 units distributed among six areas of GENERAL EDUCATION:

Basic Subjects	(12 units)
Natural Sciences	(9 units)
Humanities	(9 units)
Social Sciences	(9 units)
Applied Arts and Sciences	(4 units)
Comparative Cultural Studies	(9 units)
TITLE V	additional (6 units)
TOTAL: 58 UNITS	

Nine (9) of these units, (from at least two areas/sections) must be upper division units, and may not be taken sooner than the semester in which junior standing (60 units) is achieved. The Title V requirement can be fulfilled with an additional six (6) units.

The program is complex, difficult to explain in a clear and concise manner, and may provide an incentive for students to turn to local community colleges to complete a clearer, shorter general education program.

For example, the Intersegmental General Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) requires 39 lower division units for transfer students who are certified. A gross inequity exists between the number of lower-division GE units required of native CSUN students and transfer students.

This policy change will push the University toward examining the content and desired outcomes of general education. A reduction in general education will provide the students with greater course choices while pursuing a liberal education, focus deeper into non-major disciplines, and add minors to their degree objectives.

In a study of the over 35,000 students who graduated from CSUN between 1992 and 2000, those students who started at CSUN as freshmen graduated with an average of almost eight more units than did our upper-division transfer population. This difference is consistent with a larger general education program for our freshmen as compared with the transfer students. In the Fall 2001 student survey, 36.3% of the respondents identified units in general education (after work and financial pressures and units in the major) as a significant obstacle to graduation in a timely manner.

This recommendation is herewith reported to the Faculty President for transmittal, via the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, for final recommendation by the Faculty Senate.

file Name: 10/22/03 GETF revisions.doc