



MINUTES

TO: Educational Policies and Programs Committee
FROM: Kara Maas
DATE: February 18, 2022
SUBJ: EPPC Minutes – February 17, 2022, 2:30 p.m.

Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://csuchico.zoom.us/j/87973515536?pwd=UjY3dC85cHlvVkdUQVcwNG1jUC9PdZ09>

Meeting ID: 879 7351 5536

Passcode: 001308

Our secretary for this meeting is Kara Maas (alternate: Chiara Ferrari).

All meeting materials linked here [EPPC Materials for 2/17/22](#)

Commence 2/17/22 2:33PM

Attendance: Adamian, Allen (Miller), Bailey, Cline, Ellis, Ferrari, Ford, Grassian, Gray (Peterson), Jenkins, Kralj, Maas, Medic, Millard, Salehi, Seipel, Son, Thompson, Vela

1. Approve Minutes for February 3, 2022 - Approved
2. Approve Agenda for February 17, 2022 - Approved
Introduction Item (Time Certain 2:45): Senator Medic motioned to amend time certain to 3:00pm, Senator Ford seconded motion, motion approved 3. Proposal to Reorganize Academic departments Within College of Business (Dean Terence Lau) Senator Allen: For the faculty, how will the personnel standards be reconciled with faculty moving to a different department? Have policies and procedures been established? Response: RTP standard, order of assignment for lecturers, room assignments, COB is working through it all. RTP (because of the new FPPP), already working on new RTP standards. This is an opportunity to reopen discussions. Discussing discipline specific or department specific RTP. Faculty will go through RTP they were hired under. Senator Seipel: Those against rationale, what were the reasons? Response: It was a yes/no vote and didn't ask for rationale for the "no" vote. Also, don't know who voted "no." It was a faculty led committee that met 11 times. Can get guidance to possible rationale by looking at

the pros and cons of each option explored within the proposal.
Call for vote: 17 yes; no opposition: passes unanimously

Discussion Item:

4. AB 928 (Rick Ford, Statewide Senator and Kara Maas, Office of the Registrar)

Kara Maas and Marianne Paiva available to provide additional information

Background (offered by Senator Ford):

- Ford shared language from AB 928
- Deadline for submission of recommendations is May 31, 2023
- Ford explained the implications of the bill to EPPC, including the whole timeline of this process

Ford then explained the details of the number of units included in GE (34 units allowed by the law)

Charge: recommending a constricting GE program, with fewer units than the existing ones

Ford shared a comparison between CSU and UC GE Areas and called for Kara Maas to expand. In the IGETC pathway there is no Area E compared to CSU GE Breadth. The UC does not require Oral Communication.

UC courses: 11, CSU courses: 12

There are also some difference in terms of criteria for competency. CSU require C- in the golden four areas (A1, A2, A3, and B4), while the UC require a C or better in all areas.

Questions were asked about the foreign language requirement in the UC and how it impacts transfer students. Whether LOTE is added or not, this should not affect the number of units required.

Sources are sharing that in the UC IGETC pattern, the 3 units for ethnic studies will replace 3 units in the social sciences requirement.

Dean Trethewey asked clarification in relation to Area F counting for Social Sciences in the UC: does this mean that the UC are lowering their overall GE units? Maas responded, that the units would remain the same for the IGETC pattern.

There is still much uncertainty about what the patterns will look like in the future.

ASCSU and Chico State Academic Senate are asking to collect feedback in relation to modifications to the GE singular pathway.

How much latitude do we have in the feedback that can be provided? Are we to assume that Oral Communication must be eliminated as a requirement for GE?

This is now a requirement for transfer, the GE pathway as we offer to freshmen would not be affected for now, but it's not out of the question that in the future we will be asked to align with the new singular transfer pathway.

Ford share the expected timeline for feedback and recommendation and future modifications to be made: see slide 7.

Questions were asked about the LOTE requirement and clarification about whether or not it would affect the number of units, which would not.
Another question was brought up in relation to other ways to show proficiency in LOTE, especially as HIS institutions.

Ford opened up the question about whether or not we need to create a subcommittee of EPPC to provide a recommendation. Questions were asked how this would benefit EPPC since EPPC is a body which is primarily a neutral body that does not necessarily take sides. Also, why is this not a recommendation that comes from the full Senate.

A comment was made that these changes have a broader impact than just a curricular one, and has the potential to affect underserved students, so EPPC was invited to hear more information about these modifications.

A question was asked about what recommendations have been shared so far or what approaches have been considered.

Some approaches:

1. Data-driven recommendation
2. Avoid requiring an additional course in all CCs

What does it mean to reduce units in the transfer GE curriculum but not in the 4-year students? This law is now only required for transfer students following the pattern.

The CAB Chair confirmed that this item has also been discussed in CAB, but hasn't participated in the feedback process yet, for similar concerns about maintaining impartiality that were brought up about EPPC.

A question was brought up about whether the idea of creating an ad-hoc committee of EPPC will have to go through EC approval.

Ford and Chair Kraji asked for interest in potentially participating in the ad-hoc committee.

5. Announcements & Other

a. Meeting for Cross-listing Subcommittee

Guest Jason Nice questions:

Could you please repeat the rationale for this policy? I didn't attend the EPPC meeting on January 27, but I read in the minutes that the policy "would be advantageous for us with some of the new ethnic studies, proposals and different GE changes."

Could you please explain how it would be advantageous for ethnic studies, and how it would be advantageous to other GE changes?

- If the rationale for this policy concerns ethnic studies, has this subcommittee consulted ethnic studies faculty?
- If the rationale for this policy concerns GE, has this subcommittee consulted with CAB?
- Is this subcommittee only proposing a policy regarding cross-listing? Or will it include other curriculum matters, like

department ownership of course prefixes?

- b. Call for Subcommittee to revise EM 76-15

Chair Kralj, Senator Allen, Senator Gray volunteered and recommended inviting Holly Ferguson because of her extensive knowledge and work with academic structure. Chair Kralj suggested anyone else interested in working on this subcommittee should reach out to her via email.

- 6. Adjourn: 3:53pm