



M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Educational Policies and Programs Committee
FROM: Mahalley Allen, Chair
DATE: February 23, 2021
SUBJ: EPPC Minutes – February 25, 2021, 2:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Allen, Adamian, Atfeld, Bailey, Buffardi, Bruns, Ellis, Ford, Gapa, Grassian, Gray, Horst, Kralj, Maas, McKee, Medic, Meehan, Millard, Miller, Peterson, Schartmueller, Salehi, Seipel, **Shepherd- minutes** (Ferrari), Snyder, Son, Unruh

ABSENT: Coiner,

1. Announcements & Other
2. Approve Minutes for February 11, 2021

Kevin Buffardi and Paul Bailey were missing from the attendance on February 11, 2021.

The minutes were approved 2:32 PM

3. Approve Agenda for February 25, 2021

The agenda was approved 2:33 PM

4. Introduction Item: Revisions to General Education Program
Guest Presenter:
Jason Nice, Chair of CAB

Allen introduced the 3 Relevant EMs to today's discussion:

Interim EM 21-002
EM 18-005
EM 19-021

There are slight differences in these EMs.

Interim EM 21-002 is a revision of EM-005 and EM 19-021.
EM 18-05 is the operational EM which is currently in effect until fall 2022.

Nice reviewed the proposed changes, some of which are in interim EM 21-002.

Interim policies are in effect for 6 months and then they need to be renewed.

There are four areas which CAB is proposing to change, including interim changes which are part of EM 19-021.

Two documents were reviewed, one was a summary of changes from CAB and the other was the EM with the incorporated changes highlighted. The recommendations are:

1. Implement all the changes in interim EM 19-021
2. Add “trust but verify” language in the “Additional Waivers and Substitutions” Section (pg. 6)
3. Add a third student representative. (pg. 7)
4. Add antiracist language to the “Curriculum oversight” Section (pg. 8) which was inspired by the “CSU, Chico Academic Senate Condemnation of Violence Against Black People and Commitment to Antiracist Policies and Practices” (10/22/2020); CAB consulted with the Acting Chief Diversity Officer, the University Diversity Council’s Campus Climate Considerations Workgroup, and the Black Faculty and Staff Association regarding this language and addition.
5. Maintain the USD graduation requirement and require a non-Ethnic Studies diversity course on race, ability, age, class, culture, gender identity and express, political affiliation, regional and national origin, religion, and/or sexuality.

Nice comments on these recommendations:

Not rock the boat/not change too much. There were several meetings held regarding the US diversity requirement since November and the last visit to EPPC.

Maintaining the USD requirement was a frustrating and difficult discussion in CAB. They voted on 4 options, including an option to add a sustainability requirement as a graduation requirement. The discussion was described as a “debate on the problems of our time” regarding concerns about racial justice or climate change.

A simple majority vote of CAB voted to maintain the USD requirement in addition to the Area F Ethnic Studies requirement.

The USD section remains unchanged because MCGS and BSS have requested that the USD designation be removed from Area F. By taking an Area F course then students would not fulfill USD.

Discussion on the yellow sections that were included in the interim EM:

The document that is being reviewed is an EM, the formatting does not look like they usually do. The recommendation before CAB is to add/change the EM with the highlighted portions of the EM would be an addition/edit and would effectively replace all existing EMs. The reason for this is both updates are needed and due to the interim EM expiring.

It was recommended that the proposal be formatted as EMs usually are as they come in order to clarify that EPPC is revising and updating an official EM rather than a recommended document from CAB.

The yellow highlights are already in EM 21-002 which is set to expire in 6 months; there is an option to extend the interim EM, however it will affect both the catalog and registration if we continue to keep interim EMs in place. Overall the document which is being reviewed supersedes EM 19-201 which is set to take effect fall 2022.

This EM revision will need to be through Senate by the end of Fall semester at the very latest; however, if any significant changes are made (by EPPC or Senate) in late fall, CAB would not be able to implement such changes.

A timeline of the EMs for Senate and how each one aligns was recommended.

The sustainability requirement wasn't meant to be a "false choice" where the choice would be one or the other, but it is a significant challenge for California that needs to be addressed.

Blue highlighted sections of the EM provided to EPPC- Additional Waivers and Substitutions:

- The question was raised if departments were consulted about revising the waiver section so that those departments know how to interpret it. It will only impact a handful of programs (high unit majors). It is recommended that EPPC representatives reach out to their continuants to discuss the wording and offer suggested language.
- Which majors would be impacted are listed here: <http://catalog.csuchico.edu/viewer/GENED/GEMAJORMOD.html>. It was clarified that this change would only apply to substitutions which require approval by the Chancellor's office to completely waive a requirement for students from a GE requirement. This is not for individual waivers or major substitutions. This is not for on campus waivers but only when CO approval for the waiver is required.
- Nursing may need to be granted additional waivers due to this change because the major will be impacted by the diversity change.
- This clause is not looking at reviewing existing proposals, only new waivers.
- Agriculture: Would pose a challenge to students to graduation
- Waivers will still be allowed, but there needs to be documentation to support the need for waivers such as an accreditation issue.
- This clause is not intended to take away anything from any department.

Membership of CAB: Change of number of students on CAB

The three student representatives would be the AS President or designee, the Director of University Affairs or designee, and one student appointed by the Associated Students.

- More student representation would increase student's voices and increase advocacy and diversity of CAB.
- Suggested to add if students are voting or non-voting and the length of time they serve.
 - o The addition of terms was suggested: One year, renewable one time for the appointed student.
- Suggested that EPPC member should also be a voting member.
- Suggested that Ex-officio should also have voting rights as many of these positions hear directly from students about General Education.

Antiracism language added:

- Wording change: “departments or programs will explain” instead of “courses”
- “Courses will explain”: what happens if departments don’t this?
 - o Courses may be removed by vote through the review and recommendation of CAB. CAB discussed a rubric in order to evaluate. It is intended that the courses or the department will describe how they are implementing this.
- The purpose was to take language from the resolution and incorporate it into campus policies.
- The first sentence of the paragraph and the added language about antiracism might not go together as the first sentence is referring to EO 1100 but the new language does not draw from this policy. If EO is at the Chancellor’s Office level as a requirement, and the antiracism clause is a local requirement, that these should be separated.
- Wording change suggestion: “will provide evidence of” instead of “explain how.”
- This clause could be accomplished by any class as a pedagogical practice, it is not subject dependent. You should have an explanation of how you are structuring your classroom to dismantle racist practices and how you reach all of your students.
- Wording suggestion to separate from the EO requirement: “Additionally,” added at the beginning of the sentence.
- If classes/instructors cannot explain, or provide evidence, of how they are cultivating equitable classrooms when the campus is reaching predominantly BIPOC, we are doing a disservice to our students. There should be some understanding of pedagogical practices that become equitable, and within that language means that you are mindfully engaging in antiracist policy. These actions and classroom practices signifies that instructors are intentionally acknowledging BIPOC backgrounds and communities. It is not necessarily teaching antiracist pedagogies but rather sharing that you will be engaging in antiracist pedagogies to support students who are not in line with Eurocentric policies.
- Specific sections may be taught using different pedagogies than other sections.
- Understanding how effective antiracist pedagogical
- It’s not all subjective, the equity is not subjective. There are two approaches, either we are not accepting that our BIPOC students are not achieving as much as non BIPOC students or that there are flaws in the way that content is presented to students, which is demonstrated by the equity gap. A student will not learn from an instructor that does not respect their background or culture. BIPOC face systemic barriers to achieve the same goals as non-BIPOC student but have to work harder to achieve it. Instructors must put in the work to reform their instruction practices to support all the students in their class and to determine that it is not on the students to overcome the Eurocentric white instruction practices.
- We are not going to dismantle institutional systematic white supremacist policy by not taking some bold risks. This takes a first step in bold policy. There are research-based practices which instruction work effectively and which do not. Traditional lecture benefits a specific group of students who had a very structured high level of instruction coming into the university, which is changing when the student demographic has not had this traditional structure. This policy starts to move the needle, but it does not state a high risk of being removed from GE if there is one section that is not implanting antiracist policy.
- By changing the course to the department, then the responsibility will be placed on the department instead of the individual to demonstrate and show their pedagogical practices in this area.
- The university needs to demonstrate through our policies that we are supporting BIPOC and take risks to demonstrate our anti-racist intentions.
- Equity scorecard could be utilized to evaluate anti-racism practices and pedagogies, it could possibly be added in order to be measured and assessed. At action now would be the time to add this so the EM does not need to be revised later.

Other EM discussion: Policy on Policies states that the whole document is open for discussion, review, and changes.

- CAB's recommendation did not include changes to USD. The Area F courses for fall 2021 are giving up their USD designation. There is no policy provision regarding if Area F can have a USD designation in the future and maybe this should be addressed.
- The administration of GE: CAB is responsible for the deletion of courses. Suggested to clean up the language to clarify what CAB is responsible for (removing courses from GE) and that departments are responsible for the deletion of courses. CAB can delete courses from GE, but they don't delete the course as an offering overall. Departments may also delete a course from GE, which is not clear in the EM either.
- There are some departments which will be more affected by the vote in CAB regarding the USD and Ethnic Studies requirement. Those who voted for option 3 (to remove USD) so that there would be time to assess and determine what the impact would be on courses. ECC raised concerns because their students will have a reduction in Area D which will cause them to have to find other places to meet all the graduation requirements. They will need to double count all or most all of their GE in order to graduate on time. Additionally, they will have limited options in course selection, double counting, and progress to graduation; ECC is being affected disproportionately from other colleges; There has not been proper research or data collection. Preliminary review by ECC (Jen McKee) shows 60% of ECC students will only have one course in Area C to meet USD, potentially WI or GC. Advising and Registrar's office will be strained when students are figuring out how to navigate this. Clarification on why the number of courses for selection was reduced: Since they have to double count in order to stay on track to graduation, there is now a limited number of courses to draw from.
- USD is a requirement at the university level: majors could possibly incorporate their own USD in courses, making it more relatable to students.
- College of HFA was polled and voted for option 1, as Ethnic Studies requirement is narrowly defined. Taking out the USD requirement allows a broader understanding of diversity and culturally differences.
- Who approves the USD and GC: CAB. There is a form that is reviewed and goes through an approval process.

Vote:

What are the options on the table:

- To approve as introduction
- To not approve as introduction
- To postpone

If there are major issues to review, it would be better served to go to an EPPC subcommittee to review at this point instead of sending this back to CAB. It does not seem that CAB will be able to bring different suggestions or changes than it has today.

Vote results:

18 yes 1 no. Passes as an introduction item.

Announcements and other:

Ford: brought up that the modes of instruction for fall 2021 had not gone through the shared governance process and that Digital Learning EM 20-020. There is a projection that we will still be in an emergency in fall 2021, and shared governance is being circumvented regarding modes of instruction which is outlined in 2.1 of the EM. It is not determined that we will be in an emergency in fall 2021. This is a curricular matter which falls to the department and faculty. Instead, chairs and deans are being told they need to use certain types of instruction, circumventing shared governance. The modes of instruction were determined by the administration (hyflex, online, etc.) and faculty are being forced

into specific modality. Administration is not respecting shared governance and we don't know what the future will hold. Emails have been sent where Deans are saying that faculty cannot use specific modes of instruction and they are being coerced into using other forms of instruction. There are legitimate issues as to why certain modes of instruction should not be used in fall 2021 (due to Covid) but this was not discussed with any shared governance groups and faculty did not get to choose if they use any of the new modalities or not. To create additional modes of instruction requires approval, but due to the pandemic, shared governance was not adhered to and EM 20-20 requirement.

The President made a decision that the university will be adhering to social distancing in fall, which will affect modes of instruction.

There is a concern that hyflex is a workload concern for having to teach online and in person at the same time and may be seen as two courses in one. It does not seem that CFA has been consulted in regard to workload.

Hyflex was added as part of the options for teaching rather than a requirement to be used.

There may need to be a vote in departments to change the modes of instruction, which was not addressed when the determination was made regarding modes of instruction for fall 2021.

Not everyone feels coerced to try to offer face-to-face courses. Not every department would hold an official vote, as some departments may, to change modes of instruction.

There needs to be information in order for decisions to be made, and there is a lack of information on how to use the classrooms and how to use hyflex.

While shared governance is important, the pandemic and health and safety of the campus and students. Emergency standpoint over shadowed shared governance.

Teaching Climate Change Resilience 10-12 from FDEV on Zoom on 2/26/2021

UBC is on 2/26/2021

5. Adjourned: 4:42