



M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Educational Policies and Programs Committee
FROM: Mahalley Allen, Chair
DATE: October 6, 2020
SUBJ: EPPC AGENDA – October 8, 2020, 2:30 p.m.
32 attendees at 2:45 scree shot. (32 also at 3:27)

1. Minutes for September 17, 2020 were approved without change

2. The agenda for October 8, 2020 was approved without any changes

3. Discussion Item: Equity Scorecard

Guest Presenter: Susan Green, University Diversity Council and chair, Department of Multicultural and Gender Studies

[\[Attachment 3\]](#)

Susan Green turned the scorecard discussion to Sara Cooper. Sara presented a history of the project (blaming Jason Nice and thanking him). According to Sara, Jason Nice (CAB Chair) explained the need to the University Diversity Council (UDC) who then offered to take on the task of trying to measure equity, inclusion, diversity and social justice. An ad hoc committee was formed to take on the task of building or finding an appropriate instrument. Examples of metrics were provided by Sara. The initial effort applied more to courses than programs and so additional work was done to create program level metrics. UDC reviewed the scorecard and then it went back to CAB. CAB reviewed the scorecard but members felt a different approval process might be needed. At this point it was decided the scorecard should go to EPPC, which is where we are now.

Susan then went over some of the elements of the current scorecard, providing highlights of data that had been retrieved. One question is what the next steps should be.

Annie Adamian presented several questions that had come up about the scorecard (e.g. who would use this and how would it be used). She suggested that perhaps EPPC could authorize a subcommittee to consider the steps needed to put the scorecard into action. It could be a year-long process in her view.

Chair Mahalley Allen pointed out that EPPC generally deals with program level issues and that CAB generally deals with course level issues. It was offered that STEM disciplines would show poorly on the presented metrics on the scorecard in part due to disproportionately low representation by URM in STEM programs and courses.

The need for some type of self-assessment tool was expressed and that the status quo has low stakes (lacking teeth) regarding equity metrics. Somehow, we need the equity assessment outcomes to produce positive actions.

It was expressed that this tool should be developmental rather than punitive. It was commented that the percentage of women earning PhDs is not improving, and other demographic groups are not properly represented in the population earning PhDs. The relative ranking in the scorecard does not seem to take into consideration national demographic realities in different specific disciplines.

Daniel Grassian expressed support for the idea and offered to serve on any subcommittee tasked with this. WASC program review guidelines would be a place this scorecard could be useful, but he observed that many programs avoid WASC program review if they have program review for required accreditation. Self-assessment can be valuable but risks of unconscious bias are greater than with an independent external program review.

The committee continued a rich discussion regarding the issue and challenges we face in the pursuit of equity, inclusion, diversity and social justice. It was offered that defining our terms in the scorecard is important. For example, what does “underserved” mean and is it the same for all disciplines? It was offered that co-curricular activities like clubs might have a role to play in program level assessment.

Could an equity check be part of the different discretionary approvals like new courses, new hires, new programs, etc.?

The national dilemma of having appropriate faculty diversity so that the future pool of professor candidates has appropriate diversity and vice versa was observed.

It was offered that while not all courses should make Equity, Inclusion, Diversity and social justice a central theme, all courses should or could take those issues into consideration. Programs should be thinking about those things to ensure an environment all students and faculty can thrive in.

Mahalley commented that the role of lecturers needs to be recognized in this effort.

Susan Green said the UDC workgroup on the scorecard would be happy to work with those who Senate Chair Boyd and EPPC Chair Allen sent to them. Annie Adamian also supported inviting EPPC folks to join their effort. Mahalley said she would report back to the Senate Executive Committee.

Ella Snyder offered that she could help with student representation to help those that continue this work.

4. Information Item: Ethnic Studies Requirement

[AB 1460](#)

[EM 19-021](#)

[Chancellor's Office FAQs](#)

[ASCSU Recommended Core Competencies](#)

[Chancellor's Office Response Regarding Core Competencies](#)

Mahalley Allen began the discussion with a review of the history of the progression of the Ethnic Studies curriculum starting in 1968, She then presented an overview of where things stand today and the timeline of actions proposed by the chancellor's office . It was pointed out that engineering programs will have a tough time adjusting their GE modifications to accommodate the new GE requirement. Conversation focused for a while on the timeline of campus activities expected by the CO. In particular folks expressed hesitance to begin developing policy based on a hypothetical draft EO, as called by the CO. Resolutions calling for the rescission of the July BoT Title 5 change were mentioned. The sentiment was expressed that perhaps we should support those resolutions. Rick Ford explained the meeting schedule of the ASCSU and that we have opportunities to strengthen our position in support of rescission of the July Title 5 changes. Other complication issues precipitated by the Title 5 change including the lower division GE requirement were expressed.

Mahalley went over some of the steps that need to be considered including modification to EM 19-021. This item will be on future EPPC meeting agendas.

Information provided by curriculum services regarding waivers and double-count majors was requested and a link to current GE exceptions was provided in the zoom chat.

5. Announcements & Other

CSU Graduation Initiative 2025 Convening, Friday, October 23, 10-11:15 am. Register [here](#).

Free flu shots on campus at various times and locations, including drive thru opportunities.

6. Adjourn 4:39