

SUBJ: EPPC MINUTES – March 11, 2021, 2:30 p.m.

Quorum met, commenced at 2:31PM, March 11, 2021

PRESENT: Allen, Adamian, Altfeld, Bailey, Buffardi, Bruns, Coiner, Ellis, Ferrari, Ford, Grassian, Gray, Horst, Kralj, Maas, McKee, Medic, Meehan, Millard, Miller, Peterson, Schartmueller, Salehi, Seipel, Shepherd, Snyder, Son, Unruh

ABSENT: Gapa

1. Approve Minutes for February 25, 2021 - Approved, no comments
2. Approve Agenda for March 11, 2021 - Approved, no comments
3. Information Item: Implementation of 2-Step Verification with Duo Guest Presenter: Andy Miller, Acting Vice Provost for Information

Question regarding students using tokens versus phones to authenticate.

Answer: most students choose to use their phones but campus will send tokens if requested.

Question - sometimes "remember me" button is unticked (greyed out)

Answer: will reach out to ITSS to explain (may have to do with cookies)

Question: timing may be difficult with finals or other work done. Can the deadlines be delayed? Also, can alumni be involved?

Answer: only active Faculty/Staff/Students are required. Alumni and non-active faculty are not included.

There is a "nag screen" until the deadlines to request people to set it up. The process takes 1-2 minutes and it is not in front of Blackboard. There will be a comprehensive communication campaign.

There is no room for pushing the deadlines.

4. Discussion Item: Re-visioning Campus Assessment and Program Review Guest Presenters: Susan Avanzino and Ryan Patten [time certain: 2:40 pm, begin 2:45]

WASC's key suggestion is improving quality assurance.

Trying to ground assessment across all academics instead of just within programs. Need a thread of feedback.

Question: EPPC will need some time to digest this. External review includes a stipend and is really involved. If EPPC is involved, a difference between its role and that of an external reviewer is necessary. Examples of types of problems that have been illuminated would help. There are concerns about workload.

Answer: Campus review of undergraduate programs is necessary. There will be multiple levels of feedback. Workload is not comparable to external reviewer, but is more than what we do now. There should be support mechanisms. Will try to gather samples.

Suggestion: Students should be included for new perspectives.

Response: Involving students in the reviews themselves is already done, but point is taken.

Question: What is the interface with external accreditation?

Answer: Currently, there is no feedback within the campus. Point is to loop in feedback from campus to providing feedback as well. They will get the report when it is completed and provide additional feedback.

Question: Are there different measures of student success like equity and so on?

Answer: This is about established quality and that our standards are set and tied to college priorities. Some of that fits into the college level and not necessarily program review.

Question: Is there some sort of metric to measure whether or not this approach is successful?

Answer: We are learning from leaders (identified by WASC). We are learning to track students' learning. The group is meant to hold each other accountable. There aren't specific metrics for goals/benchmarks.

However, there are objectives from the task force.

Currently, there is not enough meaningfulness or recognition captured in the process.

We are hoping to warehouse these resources and reports to build upon and learn from, campus wide.

Question: CHAIR: what do people think about this additional task to EPPC?

Comments:

- There is a resolution on integrating equity gap discussions on learning from each other.
- Workload needs to factor in the efforts already ongoing -- hopefully not reviewing another program when own program is under review.

Response: The volume of work is not super overwhelming ... for example with assessment, each member of the assessment and program review committee would have about 8 - 9 assessment reports to review. Each report would take about 1 hour to review and respond

to, so about 8 -9 hours of work for an academic year. 8 - 9 hours is more than zero, but not crushing.

5. Action Item: New Certificate in Educational Technology and Distance Learning Guest Presenter: Tal Slemrod, School of Education

Course titles are corrected. Library material has been updated with a statement. Certificate <-> MA program has been detailed (the transfer of units).

Also updated course numbers with two 5xx courses moved to 6xx.

Question: Investigated similar programs and found several classes in MS for Educational Technology that addressed Learning Sciences. Is that incorporated in this program or is it distinct?

Answer: 626 as a new course will incorporate more theory into it. Unlike MS programs, ours is more practitioner-focused but the certificate would help prepare students to go into our Masters and take that coursework.

Question: Is a bachelor's degree required?

Answer: Yes, all courses are graduate level.

Call to vote. Passes without opposition.

6. Action Item: Revisions to General Education Program EM Guest Presenter: Jason Nice, Chair of CAB General Education Program Interim EM 21-002 General Education Program EM 19-021(revised) General Education Program EM 18-005 [Attachments 6a, 6b]

CAB made revisions.

Move to make amendment (A) to include, "who shall serve a one-year term, renewable twice." to student representative.

Seconded.

Discussion:

- Want a specification of the terms, which were not described.
- Consulted students and felt that two renewable terms would be appropriate.

Call to vote on amendment. (A) Passes without opposition.

Move to make amendment (B) on Curriculum Oversight:

"In keeping with the Academic Senate "Resolution Regarding Equity Gaps of Underrepresented Minority Student Achievement" adopted April 4, 2019, at the time of GE review, course proponents will explain how equity gaps have been addressed and provide data concerning those equity gaps as defined in the resolution."

Seconded.

Discussion:

- Minutes from last EPPC meeting were excellent and reflected comments well.
- Substituting the existing sentence might not be appropriate because data outcomes and pedagogy/practices are not the same. It is worth keeping both.
- Is it possible to address the equity gap without adopting anti-racist practices?
- It doesn't take anything away from the amendment to also include the sentence marked for removing.
- Our data only reflect URM, but not necessarily religion, or other factors that could be part of inclusive classrooms but not covered by the equity gaps.
- What is considered "been addressed" for an equity gap? If the gap has lowered is it satisfactory?

Move to amend (B1) the amendment (B) to supplement current language with amendment language instead of replacing it.

Seconded.

Amendment to the Amendment called to vote. (B1) Passes with 1 opposition.

Move to make amendment (B2) to amendment (B): Recommend "provide evidence of" instead of just "will explain" and add "course proponents" instead of just "course"

Seconded.

Discussion:

- Sharing data might be a policy conflict, but sharing course-wide data vs instructor data might resolve the problem Call to vote on amendment. (B2) Passes with no opposition.

Move to make amendment "non-instructor specific data" instead of just "data"

Discussion:

- "We can add 'if available'"
- If available provides a loophole to not provide evidence. Suggest making it more ambiguous.

Call to vote on amendment. Passes by majority.

Call to vote on amendment. Passes.

Move to make amendment: Add "One representative from Academic Advising Programs, and one representative from Graduation Advising (Registrar)" as own bullet-point, striking from Ex-Officio, non-voting members

Discussion:

- Q: Who selects those roles? A: Appointed by the program.

Passes, no opposition.

Motion to strike "non-voting" from EPPC member.

Seconded.

Discussion:

- Voting rights makes a difference in how member interacts with the group
- Non-voting status was made on purpose, suggests vote can be expressed in EPPC on items that go to EPPC/Senate but vote on other items in CAB.

- This role might be advisory and might not need to be a voter on CAB, but do not feel strongly about it
- Difficulty to dedicate time to this volunteer position, there should be recognition of that with a voting opposition Call to vote on amendment. Passes without opposition.

Move to make amendment: USD: revise to "One course \*outside Area F\*" Seconded.

Discussion

- MCGS agrees with this sentiment.

Call to vote on amendment. Passes without opposition.

Call to vote on action item. Passes by majority.

## 7. Announcements & Other

There will be a funded opportunity for FLC, email to come.

Registration for Sustainability Conference TWTS is opened

Recognition of work on MOIs

Officially AS election season. April - newly-elected students will join.

Videos available on modes of instruction to facilitate discussion and will be shared soon.

All faculty/senator email for statewide senator position election.

Nomination will open for senate officer soon, too.

## 8. Adjourn: 4:32.