



M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Educational Policies and Programs Committee
FROM: Ana Medic, secretary
DATE: November 20, 2020
SUBJ: EPPC MINUTES – November 19, 2020, 2:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Adamian, Allen, Bailey, Buffardi, Ellis, Ferrari, Ford, Horst, Grassian, Gray, Kralj, Medic (Gruber), Maas, Meehan, Millard, Miller (Altfeld), Peterson, Schartmueller, Salehi, Sanchez, Seipel, Son, Unruh

ABSENT: Gapa, Perez, and Shepherd

GUEST: Holbert (Snyder)

<p>1. Approve Minutes for November 12, 2020 [Attachment 1] Son was incorrectly listed as absent for 11/12/2020 EPPC meeting. This will be corrected. Minutes approved.</p>
<p>2. Approve Agenda for November 19, 2020 [Attachment 2] Amend agenda by changing item #7 “Action Item: Resolution Requesting Credit/No Credit Policies” to item #3 Crossed numbers (old agenda); new numbers match new amended agenda. Agenda approved</p>
<p>3. #5 Discussion Item: Ethnic Studies Requirement Guest Presenter: Jason Nice, Chair of Curriculum Advisory Board EM 19-021 Attachment 3a = CSU GE Breadth Draft Executive Order Attachment 3b = Items for EPPC Discussion Attachment 3c = AB 1460</p> <p>EPPC Chair introduced the item: The Board of Trustees met on Tuesday and Wednesday (November 17&18). When the Board of Trustees makes changes to Title V that is a change under Administrative Law and they are required to do a 45 day legal notice, which they did. The only change was to remove the words “and social justice” from Title V, which they voted to</p>

do. Many of the campuses (18 out of 23) expressed the opposition to their changes to the draft executive order and specifically to the Board of Trustees changes to Title V that happened over the summer. There was a small amount of discussion on Tuesday and then on Wednesday, the Board of Trustees approved the consent agenda which included general education. Expectation is that a new area F in GE will add ethnic studies requirement for students starting Fall 2021.

Second, reducing area D by three units. There was no discussion at all at the BoT meeting. There is a short timeline to make some of these changes and so the curriculum advisory board is going to have to implement some of the changes that are going to be required by the executive order when we find out exactly what it says.

Discussion continued on attached document 3b

EPPC skipped top part of a document as this did not occur at the BoT meeting and continued with bottom option "If BOT approves deletion of "and social justice" and the Ethnic Studies requirement is a GE Area F."

The curriculum advisory board (CAB) is going to have some work to do on the GE EM 19-021. EPPC will discuss and provide feedback to campus and CAB.

Discussion: area F will be added (ethnic studies)

No additional discussion as EPPC members agreed area F will be added.

Should we remove USD requirement? Or reimagine a new graduation requirement in line with the University Strategic Plan and/or High Impact Practices?

EPPC members started discussion on point 2 to provide some feedback to the CAB. Should we remove the USD requirement, or should we reimagine that requirement or not change it at all.

The US diversity requirement is a requirement of Chico State (EM19-021), but not of CSUs. Further discussion included both opinions: to remove USD requirement as this may impact high unit major students vs do not remove USD requirement as it provides wide diversity of courses for our students. Different colleges/departments might have variations in selecting courses for their students to complete their degrees. Removing USD can impact them by limiting available options. Another member suggested to keep waiving option and more flexibility for either the global studies or the USD for STEM students as they may struggle how to finish degree without adding more units.

Register Office comment that waive does not happen automatically. In case when student takes multiple global culture courses and not USD (or vice versa), register's office have substituted one of them, but did not waive it. Challenge is recognized when STEM students is left with only one UD pathway course, for which they're being expected to satisfy multiple disciplinary areas, which can't be done because there isn't a class at all at

Chico State that satisfies global and USD. Transfer students that do not have completed area F and/or diversity courses when transfer to Chico State may be in similar situation, not being able to complete all requirements without adding more units to their pathway and prolonging time to graduate.

Other members recognize these limitations; however, it has been noted that the goal of having all these courses is to improve diversity understanding different cultures and prepare our students for world challenges. Many of most of the highest unit majors are also majors that struggle with diversity currently. This may impact the ability to later make hires of minorities to teach these disciplines as they do not exist in work field in real life. It is important to keep this on our minds as we continue further discussion and challenges. Understanding the diverse perspectives that we cohabitate with in the United States of America is as a piece of curriculum as anything we're studying.

Link was shared to show this USD courses diversity:

<https://catalog.csuchico.edu/viewer/20/GENED/DIVRNONEUN.html>

It has been acknowledged that these ECC majors and STEM majors, a lot of them they are high unit majors, struggle to include all GE requirements and graduate on time. By making exceptions, we are helping them graduate but at the same time remove important courses that provide diversity in their academics. Concern was made that they are not receiving the same education as other majors. However, we all want students to be able to graduate. Many EPPC members agree this is a deeper issue than just academics.

Jason Nice clarified that in the area F five of the nine courses have USD but eventually all nine will. Therefore, students whether in a high unit major or a low unit major will be getting their USD course in area F. Question is whether there should be another diversity requirement that is not met by area.

EPPC member commented that expanding diversity would benefit all students. It would be good to have our students in BSS, in arts and humanities to have more information about technology that they have their hands on these days and how it might impact their careers in the future so. Another option would be to have more diversity within Chico State and have area with non-ethnic studies diversity requirement, change it to sustainability or some other graduate requirement.

Concern was made that some colleges may be in situation where current USD course will not qualify as ethnic study requirement. In general EPPC members currently support option to not remove USD requirements, but encourage further discussion. In addition, we do not have to change this right now and we are still waiting on official EO.

At Chico State, every ethnic studies course that meets those core competencies will automatically be certifiable by CAB. Campus currently do not have need to any any new graduation requirements.

Jason Nice: In the next few weeks after the break CAB will be working on some changes and EPPC's current stance is to keep this as is and make no further changes. Incoming first year students, the advising that they should receive, is that the USD doesn't really apply to them because they won't meet it in area F.

EPPC final thoughts were that although USD courses are not ethnic studies courses, they are designed to double count. Therefore, keeping USD as is for a short period is fine, but ultimately we will have to make specific adjustments for a long run. The students would fulfill the graduation requirement (by Chico State) inside the GE minor but based on our conversation right now the minors wouldn't need to change for that. Advising would be the key to maintain graduation on time and not add additional units for our students.

The next item is substitutions: **Should area F rules about substitutions be added in one or more subsections?** As a reminder, new final EO will be shared this week as now we have only draft EO. Question is if final EO will have or not as an option for this requirement to be waived or substituted. Will a similar requirement be added to other areas area D, area C, area B?

Discussion continues. Adding 9 more units for STEM field (specifically engineering program, nursing as well, and some other STEM programs) will impact their student significantly. They already have a number of course substitutions. By removing that option in other areas, can create adding more units to their degree programs.

In general, EPPC members are not in support of this – to remove substitutions or waiver options. Other concern was made impact on programs that are connected to external accreditations. There could be another opportunity to look at the curriculum and see what we could make as recommended as opposed to required. Externally accredited programs might have need to include some courses as part of their degree. Imposing additional campus requirements, can severely impact their students. EPPC members acknowledge this and agree we should not remove substitutions and waivers.

Nursing program can't remove units from their curriculum, and they are in support of keeping both in place.

Jason Nice commented that this was a technical bullet point as the EO was pretty clear that area F can't be substituted. Question was whether just to indicate that in our local policy and not to apply it to other GE areas.

Discussion continues on **CAB membership**

Shall we keep as per EO or shall we reimagine and change it or include membership based on GE area rather than as per college representation? On page six it shows what the CAB membership is and how it is determined: CAB have eight faculty representatives, one from each college and one from the library, and all the pathway coordinators. There are also student representatives and ex-officio as non-voting members.

It has been noted that student representation was increased from 1 to 2 representatives. They are part of shared governance and have 3 members on EPPC, 3 at FASP, and 3 at the Academic Senate. Potential increase to 3 members at CAB is suggested.

It has been noted that representation at CAB was questioned in past as STEM field has been underrepresented. Question can be do we want smaller number of members at CAB to be more efficient? If one college has more members at CAB than other, then there is a fear they can influence some changes in their own benefit instead of benefit to all. Generally in last several year, if not longer, there was underrepresentation of STEM fields. It has been suggested to increase their representation especially now that there are some pathways that explicitly in food science and technology will have courses in them.

EPPC members suggested that making a disciplinary area representation would be more challenging and not as feasible e.g. F area with ethnic studies representatives. Same for other areas.

EPPC member asked how are pathway coordinators elected?

Jason Nice: they are elected. Every department that has a course in that pathway gets one vote in the election. So if your department had has a course in that pathway, then that coordinator position is up for election which is every two years. Department gets one vote, and as department they decide who to elect.

Suggestion was made to create ad hoc subcommittee to study and make a recommendation as this topic is so complex. There are so many different models and there should be a lot more discussion on this topic. Perhaps finding out what language other campuses have might be helpful on how they handle this. One of the recommendations was made that the CAB uses their time right now on the ethnic studies specific issues and maybe takes this up later. The structural components of integrating area F into this curriculum is a big task by itself.

Discussion on last points: **Implementation of Revisions - should the EM include a timeline for revisions? "The current EM 18-005 will remain in effect until implementation in fall 2022, with the exception of the policy for adding new courses to GE that will take effect immediately, and with the exception of the changes to US Diversity and Ethnic Studies that will take effect in Fall 21."**

The last bullet point here is a technical issue implementation of the revisions, should a timeline for revisions be included in the executive memorandum.

Considering that this is something that was shared only a day before, this is a new information that will be part of GE area. Concern was shared that that this would impact engineering students and potentially other STEM majors.

At Chico State, the Academic Senate is going to get involved with the provost office and see what can be done. Other majors require two specific courses for area D1 and D2. We are expecting some answers soon. It is important to continue to conduct the research and see what individual impacts might be in other colleges and if there is any college with high unit major that doesn't have area D course in their program. There are a lot of majors on campus that require specific courses for area D (about 15) that have both area d courses. Probably another 15 to 20 that have at least one specific course in area. If that course is highly specific, then impact on that program will be significant and we need to acknowledge that (engineering, nursing, recreation programs etc.). Last comment involved impact on engineering in area C that is also significant. EPPC is closing this discussion and CAB will continue work in next several weeks to implement needed changes.

4. #6 Action Item: Significant Change to BS in Agriculture

Guest Presenter: Mollie Aschenbrener, MS Education Coordinator,
College of Agriculture

Attachment 4a = proposal

Attachment 4b = summary of changes [\[Attachments 4 a, b\]](#)

Dr. Mollie Aschenbrener introduced changes made with current proposal since last meeting. Chemistry course was listed as three units instead of four. Some language that pertains to the old version was removed. Presenter pointed out that they consider changing number of units, but unless entire designation is removed, or at least for the agricultural education option, they do not see this being possible. The option in communication and leadership does not currently have those issues. Their biggest advantage is advising, which is being done with current students as well as with college students from community colleges prior to coming to Chico State to ensure that they are on right track and can graduate with this degree. However, high number of units will still be present with transfer students as they may take extra units while in community college.

They are very transparent with units for both degrees and clearly showing where units are coming from. There are two major things to consider when we look at the highest number of units. They included pre-requisites. For example, the communication course that actually counts as a GE, they specifically have that in option because it's a requirement as a prereq for the

credential program. This option has 35 units, which may seem higher number. However, they included all prerequisites; there were no hidden courses. Students can easily see the prereqs as well as make plans for their subject matter competencies, and students need those requirements to get into the credential program.

EPPC member commended the work that was done and shared the concern of increased number of units being still problematic. EPPC member praised the growth College of Agriculture has had in last few years, generally supports the conceptual framework of the degree program, and work dean Unruh and faculty has done in past for students. However, reasoning provided are not compelling rationale and justification for increased number of units and is asking for further discussion in EPPC to be moved forward. Member thinks there are too many units for this program and that similar programs at Fresno State and University of Nevada, Reno have lower number of units. Question was raised can we do this here at Chico State to lower number of units required here? Addition of 14-19 units is equivalent to an entire semester, which adds more time to graduate and extra financial burden on our students. According to CO, any program with more than 60 units will trigger significant change process and we should be aware of this. High unit issue will still be challenge for transfer students, especially in already high unit degree program, and can increase time for graduation as well as be more expensive. EPPC member asked for additional explanation why there aren't additional courses for the communication and leadership degree as well as justification for additional courses needed for ag side. Another important aspect to consider is program accreditation which is internally done and is up for a review next year.

EPPC member makes a motion not to vote on this proposal and rather send it back to the college and department for further work after which they would resubmit it to the EPPC at a subsequent date. He showed support for this proposal and is willing to work with them on these changes. Motion second, discussion continues.

For clarification purpose another EPPC member asked if those added electives were added to this high unit or there was something else that caused extra units to be added? Mollie responded that was the case. Those units were added later, plus two double counts - reduce it for 6 units. Removal of any course would remove area competency. They are being transparent for all units that are part of this process. EPPC member expressed support and would work on strengthening this proposal before moving on to next steps: Senate, Provost, CO and President approvals. Another suggestion was made to add clarification in the catalog. Therefore, students getting ag degree vs student finishing degree in journalism can have a clear picture of what path to follow. Susan said that MAP had a color designation for this reason and additional sentence will be added to this

proposal. Both sides (agriculture and journalism) expressed desire to keep this together and not go separate way. In addition, all of the courses that are in the core are also used for subject matter competency and strengthen the path students are taking in order to complete their degrees. Chico State clearly is showing all pre-requisites, which are not seen at Fresno State and University of Nevada, Reno due to which it seems their programs are having lower number of units. They are simply hiding them.

Suggestion was made to incorporate all these changes, justifications and clarifications prior to going to Senate and allow this proposal to move further down the chain. As a reminder this is a last EPPC meeting and last chance for this proposal to go through both EPPC and Senate.

EPPC members are ready to vote on a motion which is not to vote on this proposal, and to defer it until they add those changes. This would require another EPPC meeting to discuss this proposal.

Motion strike down: 8 yes/ 11 oppose.

EPPC members continue with the main proposal. There were no further questions, EPPC members voted on a proposal.

Vote: 16 yes/ 3 opposed – item passed as action item and will be in Senate next week as an introduction item.

~~5.~~ #7 Action Item: New Option in Agricultural Communication and Leadership in BS in Agriculture
Guest Presenter: Mollie Aschenbrener, MS Education Coordinator,
College of Agriculture [\[Attachment 5\]](#)
No discussion

Vote: 16 yes/ 1 opposed – item passed as action item

~~6.~~ #8 Action Item: Name Change from BS in Agriculture to BS in Agricultural Science
Guest Presenter: Mollie Aschenbrener, MS Education Coordinator,
College of Agriculture [\[Attachment 6\]](#)

No discussion

Vote: 21 yes/ zero opposed – item passed as action item

~~7.~~ #3 Action Item: Resolution Requesting Credit/No Credit Policies ...
Attachment 7a = original document
Attachment 7b = substitute document
Guest Presenter: Bre Holbert, AS President [\[Attachments 7 a, b\]](#)

Bre Holbert introduced the resolution:

Collaboration and help was provided in creating this last version of a resolution. It is a story that follows chronological changes. Added part about the chancellor's office memo, and that in summer 2020 CSU Chico

offered go virtual summer institute faculty training. We jump straight into a recommendation to the president to implement the following grading policies, and remember in our last discussion we wanted to be able to give students the option. And so, for both an F and D grades students will have the option to change it to NC (no credit).

EPPC members voted to approve and accept supplement document. 23 yes/ 0 opposed – supplement document accepted. Now discussion continues using newly accepted document.

EPPC member asked if there will be a situation where student doesn't want to convert grade to NC due to financial aid concerns? Can F, D or C change to NC have other implications? There certainly could be for D grades because those can tell if those courses are students' electives.

Mike Allen, register's office: there is a certain workload concern for staff in register's office. There is not a financial aid implication because office do retain the roster grades, to see what the assigned grades were and allow financial aid to work with that.

Michele Holmes: Bigger issue was with spring policy where one student would have more than one D, or F grade. As they just converted all of them. And that was a simpler move but the Ds. And a lot of students opted in when they realized that counted towards a degree requirement and they wanted to go back to the D grade because it was better for the Degree Progress.

Change will be made to a resolution to reflect this. Another concern was made about not being able to communicate with all students about this change and equity gap issue. Changing F grade to a NC does relieve academic consequences, but doesn't relieve the financial aid consequences. To conclude, whether F or NC there will be no financial consequences, but there will be academic pause. Last spring there were no cases where freshmen came back to the office of register and ask to change NC back to an F grade.

Motion was made to remove and change bullet point 1 to how it was before: "All "F" grades will automatically be replaced with a "no credit" grade that will NOT be calculated in students' overall GPAs."

Discussion on a motion

EPPC member asked how many students receiving Fs and Ds last spring semester? Is there a need to reach out to those students that have no forward progress on their academic careers or for two semesters because of this?

Michael Allen: 665 requests for D. 1-2 people received NC.

EPPC member **amendment to the motion** "All "F" grades will automatically be replaced with a "no credit" grade that will NOT be calculated in students' overall GPA's. Students will have the option to

revert the “no credit” grade back to an “F” grade if they so choose within one year or until degree is awarded, whichever comes first. “

Discussion continues:

If student gets NC how they receive forgiveness? They don't as NC doesn't affect student's GPA. Therefore, forgiveness is only for letter grade being removed. NC is not GPA associated. Students can have only certain number of repeats of a class. They are allowed a certain amount of attempts of re-enrolling in classes, which is tied to an executive order from the chancellor's office but you would not need to do a forgiveness petition to retake that class to earn the letter grade needed for degree completion (University policy). Concern was made by EPPC member that departments may have specific limits other than University one. We need to check that.

Vote on motion: 22 yes/zero opposed – motion passes

Continue discussion on resolution.

EPPC members expressed support and respect toward our students for advocating for themselves. Allowing faculty and students to adapt and be flexible with choices is important. By passing this resolution and moving it on we are supporting our students.

Page 3 “Dropped Fall 2020 courses will not be included in GPA calculations”

How dropped classes can affect transcript? Mike Allen: If it is before census that does come off the transcript. All WU will convert to W so they do not affect GPA and application to law schools, nursing program etc. The chancellor's office (Office of General Counsel) has given us language that we have added to every student's transcript attached to the spring and fall semester. No need to add this to a resolution as it would be redundant. Further discussion included possibility to include spring semester (mainly online in resolution. So far there has been no discussion on this topic. Chico State may pass that in terms of the fall grading policies they should continue to spring 2021, but this can happen later.

Additional comment was made to be conscious that students will still have to take 12 units to keep their full time status, and to maintain student loans and scholarships.

EPPC member **call for the question and vote for this resolution as it stands.**

There may be some language change at Senate proposed by EPPC members.

Vote on resolution as action item.

Vote: 21 yes/ zero opposed – item passed as action item

8. Introduction Item: New Minor in Biomedical Engineering

Guest Presenters: Hassan Salehi, Meghdad Hajimorad, and Kathleen

Meehan, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Time certain: 2:35 pm

[\[Attachment 8\]](#)

Meghdad Hajimorad introduced the item “New Minor in Biomedical engineering.” They needed to introduce professional training in biomedical engineering. It is supported by students who have been interested in this minor; colleges and chairs also approve this minor. Departments who have interest in biomedical engineering and related disciplines and have been successful in obtaining grants from agencies such as the National Science Foundation to support creation of this minor. This minor is multidisciplinary, which is visible in list of courses. Instrumentation courses are main focus with other opportunities working on imaging, materials aspect, mechanical engineering and mechatronics courses, independent studies/project or honors project.

EPPC member comment: number of units is usually 18-21 unit, would it be more challenging for students majoring in STEM field to have additional extra units (22 units) in their minor?

Response: San Jose University and other do not show their pre-requisites in existing number of units for their program. This minor at Chico State is showing pre-requisites due to which number of units are transparent and that is reason for which they appear higher. These pre-requisites are already part of courses taken by engineering students and therefore, they already take these courses as part of their majors.

EPPC suggested to add this as a comment to a proposal before coming as an action item.

EPPC member asked how many students may be interested in taking this minor and do you have enough faculty to teach these courses if there is a higher demand?

Response: no specific data but they foresee some 15-20 students at the beginning. Current resources are sufficient, and they have ability to cover all teaching for beginning.

EPPC member comment sequence of courses within this minor do not appear to be strongly showing biometric engineering and asked for clarification.

Response: CSUs here typically have anything from 12-18 units (without hidden pre-requisite), BIOS 103&104 show biology anatomy importance in this minor, other courses include imaging, and materials aspect. Biometrics oriented course will be added later. The reason for not being so clear is due to visible pre-requisites that hide that clear vision. Some of these courses do not have “bio” in their names, but faculty members teaching these course are collaborating and will be adding in their courses

biomedical content biomedical projects. Courses do cover content that is related to this minor.

Suggestion was made to add animal anatomy and physiology in the future

EPPC member: this minor has two special problems courses and the honors program. Why would you want students to take 3 units from this section?

Response: to provide more flexibility for students to do independent study or honors project with a faculty member. If they want to be engaged in a free unit, meaningful biomedical oriented project under the supervision of a faculty member, they can do so.

Another EPPC member confirmed the strength of this minor and courses that are part of it. In computer science seems there are 4 courses students will have to take. Question: will too many pre-requisites affect students ability to finish degree and minor or would it be a challenge?

Response: it depends on from what background students are coming from. Engineering students already have calculus and physics under their belt coming to this minor. Computer engineering students also have the pre-requisites, if they decided to specialize in those courses for the biomed minor, whether it's at the computer science level or computer engineering level. They should be able to just take it without again.

EPPC members voted.

Vote: 24 yes/ zero opposed – item passed as introduction item

9. Announcements & Other

New faculty dashboard

<https://www.csuchico.edu/fdev/homepage/faculty-dashboard.shtml>

Happy thanksgiving everyone! This is our last EPPC meeting for this semester.

10. Adjourn at 5:43 pm