



MINUTES

TO: Educational Policies and Programs Committee
FROM: Holly Kralj, Chair
DATE: October 5, 2021
SUBJ: EPPC Minutes from – October 7, 2021, 2:30 p.m.

Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://csuchico.zoom.us/j/87973515536?pwd=UjY3dC85cHIvVkdUQVcwNG1jUC9Pd09>

Meeting ID: 879 7351 5536

Passcode: 001308

Our secretary for this meeting was Chiara Ferrari.

Attendance:

Adamian, Allen (proxy for Miller), Bailey (proxy for Buffardi), Cline, Ellis, Ferrari, Ford, Geier, Grassian, Gray, Jenkins, Kralj, Maas, Medic, Millard, Peterson, Rosso, Salehi, Seipel, Son, Vela

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| 1. Approve Minutes for September 23, 2021 | [Attachment 1] |
|---|--------------------------------|

Editorial comment: adding Tyler Jenkins to the attendance list from 9/23.
Minutes were approved.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2. Approve Agenda for October 7, 2021 | [Attachment 2] |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|

Agenda was approved.

Action Items

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| 3. Department Name Change: Geological and Environmental Sciences (to Earth and Environmental Sciences) (Todd Greene, Chair of Dept of Geological and Environmental Sciences) | [Attachment 3] |
|--|--------------------------------|

Todd Green summarized the reason for the name change: better addressing what the department covers and teaches. Evidence shows that students coming from high school might not be familiar with the word geological. The Dept also proposes to change the 4-letter dept name/code from GEOS to EARTH.

No comments or questions were shared.

The EPPC Chair called for a vote and the item was approved unanimously.

4. KCSC Radio Reorganization (Transfer from Associated Students to Dept of Media Arts, Design and Technology; Tom Welsh, Chair)

[\[Attachment 4\]](#)

Discussion postponed until Tom Welsh joins the meeting.

Discussion was resumed when Tom Welsh joined the meeting.

Tom shared the organization structure of KCSC, which was requested at the previous EPPC meeting.

Licensing requirement language was added and link to SoundExchange was added in the proposal.

Seipel: asked clarification about AS plans to still support this project financially. AS has committed for financial support for 3 years and then reassess then. Seipel suggested adding this clarifying point in the proposal, about the 3-year commitment before reassessment. Tom agreed to add this information before the proposal goes to Senate.

Vice Chair Allen took over the meeting and she called for a vote.

The motion carried and the proposal was approved as an action item.

5. New Minor in Heavy Construction (Chris Souder, Construction Management & Steffen Mehl, Dept of Civil Engineering)

[\[Attachment 5\]](#)

Describing heavy constructions

Daniel Grassian: questions about why certain specific courses are required. Asking for some explanation to share in EPPC and add in writing before the proposal moves to Senate.

Chair Souder provided explanation on the concepts and content covered in those classes to clarify why they are required in the proposed minor.

Chair Kralj suggested to add section headers in the proposal with a rationale for the required courses, adding a few sentences for each course. VP Grassian appreciated the explanation received from Chair Souder.

Rick Ford brought up the issue of counting pre-requisites in the total number of units required, and avoid having hidden units. There seems some discrepancy regarding certain course requirements between pre-requisites and/or instructor's permission required (i.e. for transfer credits in place of requirements). Rick Ford is recommending to make the address of pre-requisite and instructor approval more clear and consistent throughout the proposal.

Chair Souder asked clarification on the better way to proceed to make sure that in Senate the actual number of units is not questioned.

Holly Ferguson mentioned that they are working with the department to discuss these concerns. The main topic to consider is to make the degree understandable to the students and not create false expectations or confusion.

Vice Chair Allen shared the context from the conversations she had last year when as EPPC Chair she worked with Chair Souder to prepare this proposal.

Chair Souder circled back to Rick Ford's suggested approach and also noted broader university-wide major/minor solutions in relation.

Charlene Armitage agrees that Sen Ford's suggestion takes care of the potential confusion and allows pre-requisites in both CMGT and CIVL students.

Chair Kralj asked Sen. Ford to share the suggested language in the Zoom chat. Proposed general language is below (will need to be adapted to each required course):

CMGT or CIVL or instructor permission
(and clean up CMGT 458 to match the rest of the language in the proposal)

Chair Kralj asked Sen Ford to make an official motion, Sen Millard seconded.

Nicol Gray pointed out how EPPC is not generally involved in course descriptions.

Grassian: someone could argue that students in CIVL will have some additional units to complete.

Chair Kralj called for a vote on Rick Ford's amendment. The motion carried.

Chair Kralj called for a vote for the amended document and asked for additional discussion.

Vice Chair Allen clarified that the rationale for the chosen required courses will also be required before the proposal goes to Senate, in addition to Sen. Ford's approved amendment. Chair Souder confirmed he will add the language.

Chair Kralj called for a vote for the amended document, the item was approved as action item.

Introduction Items

6. New Online Program Completion: BA in MCGS Online Completion Program (Susan Green, Chair of MCGS; Sara Cooper, Immediate Past Chair) [\[Attachment 6\]](#)

Chair Green shared some remarks about the proposal. She pointed out to there are a few changes since this proposal was submitted.

Three tenure track faculty were added to the department, one lecturer is now an ITC in TLP, and the department has now an ASC.

Chair Kralj asked Sara Cooper to add some additional context and guide the EPPC members through it:

Started exploring the possibility to create an online program before Covid. Covid also a further catalyst for faculty interest in pursuing this program. Three main motivations:

1. Student degree completion support + usefulness/accessibility of online.

2. Desire to grow the major
3. Looking to success of other programs as examples (CORH and Sociology)

Consultation with Kate McCarthy, Daniel Veidlinger, Tony Waters, and RCE to prepare for this move. HyFlex interest and objective of inclusion also part of their process. Flexible options for students are desirable.

Aim to guarantee that every student coming in with 60 units could finish this degree and a recommended minor in 2 years.

Ferrari (also noting conversation with ATO Kathy Fernandes as informing these concerns and questions): Online Program Process: lack of central understanding, planning, design or process in moving to online degree programs:
We need to be careful in considering the difference between teaching all our courses online vs creating a fully online program.

1. Enrollment: “Based on the examples of other campus-based online completion programs (e.g. Sociology, Comparative Religions and Humanities) the program will increase the number of students who major in MCGS. We expect to collaborate with two departments by incorporating one cross-listed course from each. Due to the Covid pandemic safety measures, all of our existing courses now have online versions; we will offer our existing courses face to face and online (with guaranteed seats for online students) on a rotational basis as per the online completion course sequence plan.” (page 5) – what evidence does the department have for this?
2. Demand: We expect demand for our program in general will resume its rise as colleges and universities across the country begin to see stabilized enrollments. Our online completion program will attract those individuals for whom ftf instruction is either impossible or not preferred. (page 6) – this is against general enrollment trends though, is there any evidence for this potential increase in demand? I appreciate the data on page 8, though
3. Pedagogy: “Due to the Covid pandemic safety measures, all of our existing courses now have online versions; we will offer our existing courses face to face and online (with guaranteed seats for online students) on a rotational basis as per the online completion course sequence plan. (page 5) – creating a fully online program is not the same as putting all courses online during a pandemic, what is the structure in place to support this program and make it sustainable? Is there a consistent course design template? Is there a program brand that allows the online students to feel part of an online coherent program and experience?
4. Resources (page 14) – are 2 WTUs enough for a program coordinator? No support from TLP and instructional designer in relation to digital learning and academic technologies? No support in terms of marketing and promotion? Training for faculty?

Policy for the Use of Digital Technologies in Teaching and Learning: what is the status of the policy’s approval?

Cooper: Many of our faculty have received training and awards in online education and we are and want to be aware of the difference between online courses and a fully online program. We have also spent extensive time with TLP re: online teaching (Cooper agreed that the proposal should reflect this).

Cooper agrees that the institution needs a unified vision and process for online programs. We have several courses already at the highest quality levels, many at 'very good', and want to continue faculty development along these positive lines.

We have collaborated with experienced folks on campus and the data they have on student interests helps make us very confident about student interest, as do precursors such as Sociology and CORH. We are confident that we can grow as a degree/department through an online program, and we have done analysis with RCE. The department has taught in a variety of formats and MOI.

Cooper: appreciate the comment about .2 AWTUs is not enough to support the creation and coordination of this new program. Noted feedback from CORH as indicating that this workload is substantial and .2 is a bare minimum.

Cooper: Continuing Education has noted the marketing and promotion support they can offer (Jeff Lane).

Cooper: appreciated the question about branding, specifically in relation to creating a coherent experience for the online students.

Ferrari: clarified that these questions are general questions for the institution, since there seems to be a lack of resources and a process for programs that want to create online programs, and we will need a process.

Allen: agree that .2 AWTUs is not enough for this task for a coordinator, also wonders if the language is intended to suggest .2 per semester or other. Cooper acknowledges and will amend. I appreciate the inclusion of the minor as a prepackaged option.

What happens to the students who don't want to pursue one of these minors but a different one? They will need the 9 units, since it's embedded in the overall number of units, but can they take those units elsewhere?

Cooper: students could complete a different minor and we can change the language in the catalog copy to reflect this information (i.e. "recommended" instead of required).

Green: New challenges for transfers, depending upon what they arrive to CSU with.

Allen asked a clarifying question about transfer students, and whether or not Chico State students could complete this major without being transfer students. Cooper clarified that they have to be "transfer eligible," having 60 units and have fulfilled the GE lower-division requirements.

Maas: warned about guaranteeing that students with 60 units and GE requirements met will graduate in 2 years, because there is a wide variety of scenarios that students present in terms of units fulfilled, so she would be concerned about a guarantee of completion in 2 years for everyone. Maas is advising to cross that language out of the catalog, because it might be misleading. Cooper affirmed feedback, noted using CORH examples for next revision, and will develop cleaner catalogue copy for next steps.

Grassian: excited about the proposal and the fact that it will facilitate access to students. Acknowledged RCE/Jeff Lane outreach already begun as suggested, and also: suggestion about opening up further dialogue with Kathy and TLP to determine if there

is a need for more resources. “In person” program review excellent, so translating that success to online programming is now objective.

Green: “In house” resources considering both Joshua Whittinghill and Susan Frawley have worked for TLP, and we look forward to further conversation with TLP and Kathy Fernandes.

Maas: Will this program be on the TMC pathway? And also some questions and clarification about some courses double listed in the major/minor, and taking care of multiple requirements (such as writing requirement). Maas is suggesting to make a note when courses are double counting to clarify for students.

Millard: “Loves the proposal” and also commented on how MCGS students have improved our campus and it will be a loss of many of these students move online and don’t get to affect our campus as much.

Cooper: it is tragic that some of our students have had bad experiences that don’t make them feel safe on campus anymore, and we are committed to keeping them as students, but offer a safe environment. Also notes how online learning communities expand our populations in new ways.

Geier: This proposal shows the potential for looking proactively at online education, supplementing not supplanting. Groundwork docs/process resource review in development by Grassian and Clare Van Ness seems like it could support as well.

Ford: allowing local students to take the program has been a problem for liberal studies, because transfer students have been prioritized.

What happens if all of a sudden 10-15 programs move online: how does this affect enrollment, the student experience etc? We need to be careful with taking a more holistic approach to these moves.

Green: Affirmed, noted that they have worked with RCE/Chico folks to make this work. We are responding to needs we are hearing from students and the request from Kendall Hall to be more flexible with students.

Bailey: this move can truly help students across the very vast area we serve. This sort of program expands student network and diversity of students from this service region.

Ferguson: wondering if you would be open to some suggestions to reorganizing the catalog a bit and make it less confusing for students.

Green/Cooper: (Enthusiastically) open to work with APSS to clean up the catalog copy.

Maas: checking if the AITS 410W AFAM 410W status has been approved (listed as pending). The courses have not been approved yet, so they will be removed.

Chair Kralj called for a vote, the motion carried and the proposal was approved as introduction item.

Discussion Item:

7. AB 928 (Rick Ford, Statewide Senator)

[\[Attachment 7\]](#)

Ford: This is a legislative bill that was passed by the legislature, a few weeks ago, And it was signed in the flurry of bills that was signed yesterday by the governor. And so it's now law, and we now have a charge that before May 31, 2023, the intersegmental committee on academic centers which includes the ASCSU leadership will need to come up with a single GE pathway for transfer to the UC and the CSU.

Bailey: brought up concerns/questions over how this would impact high unit majors, and if there can be significant differences given the different structures/requirements of CSU and UC?

Ford: the essential differences between the UC and the CSU is two things
One is that the UC requires a language other than English in their admissions to the transfer. And that was designed to mirror their freshmen admissions, which requires two years of foreign language at the high school level. And the other is Area A1 which is oral communication, and the CSU is very strict, and requires the oral communication in the transfer curriculum, but the UC for some reason does not have a corresponding requirement. So besides that, this is the model that could work, and it represents a starting point for the questions that are going to come up are going to be these. Should we give up one as part of the transfer requirement or both?

Ford clarified more elements about Area E and F requirements and summarized the key question:

1. Are we willing to give up area A1?
2. Are we willing to add language other than English as a requirement?

8. Announcements & Other

Seipel: free flu shots clinic will be available next week

Bailey: Chico Calaveras Cycle: <https://www.csuchico.edu/clc/activities/calaveras-cycle.shtml>

Ferrari: Teaching Racial and Social Justice Series (October 10/13, 4pm)

<https://www.csuchico.edu/fdev/homepage/teaching-racial-social-justice-series.shtml>

Ford: future bills

AB 927: allows CCs to offer BA degrees.

AB 1111: requires a single course numbering system throughout the CCs.

AB 130: broadens pathways to certification of basic skills or subject matter competency for entry into teaching credential programs.

Title 5 change: expanding eligibility for “credit for prior learning”

9. Adjourned at 4:44