



MINUTES

TO: Educational Policies and Programs Committee

FROM: Chiara Ferrari, Chair

DATE: September 28, 2017

SUBJ: **EPPC MINUTES – September 28, 2017, Kendall Hall room 207, 2:30 p.m.**

Members present: Ferrari, Allen, Boyd, Connolly, Cross, Crotts, Hostetter-Lewis, Kim, McConkey, Miller, Rowberg (Roll), Schierenbeck, Watkins, Cooper, Bailey (Millard), Hammer, Loker, Hassenzahl, Aird, Camacho

Not present: Selvester, Thompson, Polsan

Begin at 2:33

1. Approve Minutes for September 21, 2017

As there were no comments or corrections, the minutes were approved

2. Approve Agenda for September 28, 2017

There were no comments or amendments, therefore the agenda was approved. A couple of resource links on curriculum redesign sources were added to the agenda under "Announcements;" the addition of these links did not require action, as it was deemed editorial. A revised agenda was emailed to everyone with the useful links.

3. Announcements

Schierenbeck: Asked Crotts about his injury. Crotts said he is doing much better

Loker: The Religious Studies program received preliminary approval from WASC to put its Bachelor's Degree program online. The faculty has been working on this for some time and is excited that they will be able to offer it next year.

Ferrari: Following up on the Senate retreat, we need volunteers to serve on the sub-committee to amend the Academic Senate constitution as per the recommendation from the retreat.

Ferrari: We have confirmed a date for Christine Mallon's visit from the Chancellor's Office. Christine Mallon is the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs and Faculty Development. She will visit us on November 30. Our meeting on that date will include her presentation followed by a Q&A, please begin to think about questions and topics we would like to discuss with her.

4. Action Item: Discontinuation of Minor in Information Technology

Tyson Henry, Chair of Computer Science, presented reasons for the discontinuation, including low meaningful enrollment and budget shortfalls that prevent the department from offering two courses required by the minor. Joe noted that as academics we continue to value of new programs as academic experiments, and because they are experiments sometimes they succeed and sometimes they do not; we should continue to feel good about trying new things.

The proposal to discontinue the Minor in Information Technology was approved with no dissent, as an action item.

5. Action Item: Discontinuation of MA in Geography

The program has been in existence since 1970, but has been suspended since 2012 and now the Department is requesting an official discontinuation. Dean Fairbanks, Chair of the Geography Department, presented the rationale citing inadequate faculty numbers to adequately staff both a graduate and an undergraduate program. Fairbanks also responded to a question from the minutes about whether or not the program could ever be renewed. He noted that there is a process to do that, but current budget conditions and State requirements do not suggest it will be soon.

Ferrari: Expressed sadness at seeing such a longstanding program come to an end.

Schierenbeck: Expressed her strong opposition to this proposal, noting that neighboring schools do not offer a similar degree, and this will leave a large area of Northern California not served by a Master's Degree in this area.

The proposal to discontinue the MA in Geography was approved with four dissenting votes, , as an action item.

6. Action Item: New Certificate in Data Science

A proposed joint certificate program bringing together the Departments of Computer Science and the Department of Mathematics and Statistics. Robin Donatello from the Department of Mathematics and Statistics was present for a second presentation of the program; she began by requesting questions and comments.

Camacho: Recalled a question about what Department would actually issue the Certificate, there was no additional information on this point, however the goal was to divide the processing as equitably as possible.

There was a possibility that the departmental identity of the student's advisor might be an important factor, but the advising situation is still flexible, and some developmental support and personnel from Computer Science has not been available.

In order to expedite the proposal, the presenters agreed that the Department of Natural Sciences will commit to administering/issuing the Certificate. The committee recommends this be included in the written document before the next Senate meeting, and further recommends that the University get some verification on this issue. The presenters agreed to work on this point and to continue to collaborate in so far as possible with the existing resources in Computer Science.

Crotts: Noted that the rationale characterizes this Certificate as an intermediate outcome in strengthening our Data Science capacity, and asked if this might be leading to a major or minor in Data Science. Robin Donatello responded that she does not believe an undergraduate minor in Data Science would be appropriate due to several current constraints. A major or even a Master's program would be viable and appropriate options if supporting larger campus organization were to develop. These directions are open to discussion, but what the next phase will be has not been defined yet.

Loker: Expressed enthusiastic support for the certificate program followed by his hope that, as the Certificate proves its value, the program sponsors might also consider providing this in an online format. He noted that this is an area of huge demand and many professionals could use this kind of learning to advance their careers. The potential positive impacts on the public and private sectors are considerable, therefore in considering the next steps for this program, online education should be part of those discussions.

Connolly: Asked if there would be new courses or if the certificate would be handled with additional sections of existing courses. Robin responded that three new courses would be added: 1) Introduction to Data Science, 2) Advanced Topics in Data Science, and 3) A Capstone course for which Computer Science currently has an existing framework, but Mathematics will need to create something in the way of a capstone course in the major. Introduction to Data Science has been offered twice, and Advanced Topics in Data Science will be piloted in the spring.

The proposal to create a New Certificate in Data Science was approved unanimously, , as an action item.

7. Discussion Item: GE foreign language requirement

Proposal to include a GE foreign language requirement in the curriculum. Guest presenters Laird Easton, Patricia Black, Chris Nichols were in attendance to present the proposal draft and seek advice. Laird Easton presented the proposal which he said has been discussed within the academic community for some time. The proposal notes that the ability to use a language other than English is essential for success in an interconnected world. It demonstrates that you have the capacity to see the world through multiple perspectives. The answer is to make foreign language a requirement for everyone. He warned that if we fail to institute this proposal current trends suggest that we may soon be able to offer only Spanish which will not encourage the kind of diversity this University values. The presenters had done peer university research and discovered that many of them do have a foreign language requirement and the more respected universities have more diverse foreign language offerings. Currently about 40% of students get the C-2 credit by taking a foreign language class.

The new requirement would replace the Global Cultures requirement which dates back to 1992. Simply stated, students would be able to meet the requirement by either taking a class or passing a test. Ideally students would have two years of the same foreign language in high school and take a third semester at the university to reach a higher level of proficiency. The proposal offers other options for transfer students and students who would like to acquire a second foreign language or students for whom English is their second language. There are also numerous testing options.

Peggy: Voiced her support, but commented that two years of high school foreign language study plus one semester at the post-secondary level would not really achieve proficiency. She suggested some rewording on that point and added that she does not want to see the Global Cultures go away, but would prefer to see foreign language in addition to the Global Cultures course.

Schierenbeck: also voiced her full support and added that as faculty in a STEM discipline she sees taking a language as a broadening experience for students in the STEM disciplines. She joked that the current national situation does not recommend discontinuing Russian.

Camacho: Agreed with Schierenbeck's comments and added that as a student with language learning experience she sees the importance of learning a language other than Spanish. As a representative of the College of Agriculture she appreciates the need for a global approach. She noted that knowing a language should also promote participation in study abroad programs. Easton added that their research indicates that students with study abroad experience overwhelmingly state that they wish they had taken additional foreign language classes.

Cooper: Voiced 100% support for the language requirement but did not favor of replacing the Global Cultures requirement as a separate and additional requirement. Easton responded that the consideration in this approach is extra units required, but that could be a discussion in itself.

Nichols: Clarified several points on means to satisfy the requirements and possible remediation. The presenters received this point with interest, and restated their intention to indicate that students would take a language class at Chico State for which they are qualified. ie at an appropriate ability level

Aird: Commented that he is undecided about requiring language; and he questioned some of the assumptions about the necessity of foreign language. He noted that his personal experience does not match the literature on the value of language learning. Aird pointed out an apparent conflict in the literature between statements of the positives of foreign language and the need to make sure we can keep offering these classes.

Nichols: Responded to the confusion that the impetus for moving forward on this proposal might have been the last minute proposed cancelation of many of these courses but the rationale is still in terms of the students' intellectual development in foreign language learning and the need to be more nearly equal to our sister campuses in foreign language proficiency. We are currently at the lower end on requirements.

Ferrari: Expressed surprise that we would be comparatively low on languages when we have so many students doing study abroad.

Boyd: Has yet to decide about the replacement of Global Cultures, but cannot find a description of what a course would have to have in order to satisfy Global Cultures, and requested that that information be provided by the next presentation. She is enthusiastic in her support of this requirement but did clarify the course level required (100, 200, 300) to satisfy the requirement. Response, one course at an appropriate level which could be 100 level, more likely 200. She suggested that some adjustment in the wording might clarify this.

McConkey: Favored the foreign language requirements, but expressed a concern about increased units and how that could be fit into the major.

Hassenzahl: Expressed an understanding of the importance of speaking more than one language but also noted that we cannot just grow GE. He asked what a student should be able to do as a result of completing a 201 level course. He questioned whether the cognitive advantage associated with speaking a second language presented in the research would actually be achieved in two semesters. It is important that people *speak* a second language not just take courses in the language. The question, then is how do we frame this and how does it become more important than something else? In terms of presentation, David advised that because others are doing it is not a good argument... perhaps they are thinking of dropping it. We need to do this because it makes sense to us. He also felt that the rhetoric that we are doing this to save programs is a bad argument and should not be repeated.

We need to do this because it is important and we need to teach languages that are important to know. David also suggested some attention as to how we determine which languages to offer.

Easton: Commented on David's input. He noted that GE is designed to introduce the thinking style or topic not necessarily to arrive at proficiency and that it is good to see what is going on other campuses, noting that we are competing with them at some level.

Ferrari: Voiced appreciation for both perspectives

Boyd: Isn't it in our guidelines that we will look at other campuses? Some random discussion followed about the merits of researching the offerings on other campuses and how this information should be used.

Bailey: Was strongly in favor of the language requirement but added two concerns. He is not inclined to remove other programs or courses to make this change and he also voiced concern about the number of units.

Easton: Explained that the reason for replacing a course with the language requirement was to address the unit constraints. The current thinking is this is a choice of one or the other.

Ferrari: So I see two recurring comments indicating a concern, she encouraged the presenters to address these in their proposal.

Cross: Would like to hear what the Chairs of the departments think of this. He acknowledged that some programs will have problems with a higher number of units. He wants feedback from constituents before action is taken.

Hammer: Asked if they were considering sign language as a foreign language. Response: that is on the list, yes

Allen: Wanted to verify if students were allowed to test out or were going to come in and be required to take a course. Response: they intend to use an advanced placement test to determine the appropriate level of entry. Katie noted that is not testing out in the usual sense. Her second question is what would happen to the current Global Cultures classes? The presenters acknowledged that they will need to talk to chairs and other programs, and were in support of keeping these classes. The third question was how will this be coded in the DPR. This will have to be resolved before this becomes an action item.

Schierenbeck: Pointed out it is important to remember the purpose of GE; students will never reach second or third year proficiency if they do not take the introductory courses. Languages and the arts are important in interpreting the sciences and in turning out a whole person.

Miller: Verified the intention that students will be required to take a language and language may count as a GE C2 credit. Response: right now the introductory classes should not count as C2; the second semester in foreign language should count as C2... as the proposal is currently written.

Loker: Followed up on the graduation requirement that students must complete one course in foreign language at the 200 level. He pointed out that almost all science majors have requirements over 60 units and would therefore be exempt unless they adjust the major requirements. The same is probably true of Math. This might mean that as much as 40% of students enrolled would still not be taking foreign language.

Boyd: Commented that in their major they have created a lot of places where their courses are all double counting GE; this is a means to lower the unit load.

Camacho: Related feedback from students that they don't feel their majors allow them to explore outside their majors. She appreciates the initiative and hopes the feedback offered will be useful in revising the proposal to make it a successful program without taking away the Global Cultures requirement.

Ferrari: Recommended that Student Senate be consulted. Response: we have them on the schedule

Crotts: Predicted that this discussion will lead to more future discussion and eventually to introductory status. He underscored the importance that the introductory proposal must be clear what the requirement is and how it must be fulfilled. The formal proposal must be more concrete and precise.

Ferrari: We will help you with that final development

Introduction of new Senators

Jim Connolly – College of Business

Darcy Hostetter-Lewis – College of Natural Sciences

8. Discussion Item: RFP for Curriculum Redesign Proposals

Ferrari: Introduced the general framework, and requested that the discussion address concerns, clarifications, and perhaps recommend changes. One major element was the curricular revisions to be implemented in the 18-19 Catalog. This can be true for minor changes but the significant changes such as the six items under discussion would have to be the 19-20 Catalog. She advised some clarification between minor and significant changes and to which catalog they can apply. The deadline for significant changes for the 19-20 catalog is January 30 (for proposals to go through Senate in Spring 2018). She suggested that one way to alleviate concerns about the aggressive timeline might be if it was possible to move the November 30 deadline back to January 30 coinciding with the other existing curriculum deadline.

Loker: The deadlines that are listed in the RFP are unrealistic; the intent of the RFP is to encourage departments to examine their curriculum in terms of its complexity and potential barriers to student progress. That may be a process that could go on for several years, an ongoing process. We should examine this RFP and hold aside the official deadlines. He also noted that the deadline for this proposal is Monday. We should try to facilitate student movement through the curriculum in ways that do not decrease quality. Regarding the time it takes for a proposal to make its way through the process, he would be open to working with Ferrari and members of the Executive Committee to see if there are ways to fast-track the proposal. He also advised that this RFP should not preclude other kinds of curriculum revision that might be needed. Some language that opens this possibility may be required.

Ferrari: Offered to share some suggestions assembled from various discussions. Clarified that the deadline is January 30, if the proposal is to go through Senate in spring; May 31, if it is to go through Senate in fall. She does agree it would be desirable to identify obstacles and find ways to speed up the process. Ferrari also sees that acknowledges deadlines can make this process more real giving faculty a clear purpose. One of the questions last time was how much money total is available, but from conversations the Graduation Initiative Team it appears that figure is somewhat open-ended; it may depend on how many proposals are turned in.

Another group of questions is about whether FLC is the only way to apply for this funding; are there any other models?

Hassenzahl: Noted that there are a couple of different ways that departments might utilize this RFP, one of the places this can be really valuable is where departments were already thinking about curriculum revisions, this might be the nudge that gets them going. His next question was what does "support faculty" mean? Is it course release time, paid time over break, or professional development or could be bring in some professionals to help facilitate the development?

Loker: it is important that faculty consult with the Deans (who also have priorities) as to the areas for development and the kinds of support faculty may receive. There is currently some strain on faculty in terms of delivering program, so course release time would have a serious negative impact on the ability to serve our students. He would, however, favor flexibility in arranging faculty support. He also recalled a productive discussion with Josh Trout, the Faculty Development Director who attended a symposium on this topic and came back with some good ideas. Ferrari plans to share the resources she collected. Bringing in an outside consultant is also a possible if the department and the Dean agree that would be helpful.

Boyd: If there are modifications to this RFP she would hope that where departments have already submitted proposals there might be some flexibility in viewing them. She also wondered about the scope that this RFP covers, where that came from. She also wondered, in light of the various initiatives on campus, if this was tied to some earmark from the Chancellor's office.

Loker: A lot of the language in this RFP came from San Francisco State which has been going through a similar process. They had external funding to jump start the project, so a lot of the conceptual framework is adopted from them. The notion that curricular redesign should be part of the graduation initiative comes from the long-term plan. Any money available is not an earmark from the Chancellor's Office. It is a happy coincidence that, in the process of examining their curriculum, departments can also meet their EO-1071 requirements.

Watkins: noted that there appear to be two pots of money assigned to graduation initiative and to curriculum redesign, and how do we know what that money is and how do we go about using it. He cited an example in which courses offered every other semester impede student progress where if those courses were offered every semester graduation speeds would immediately increase.

Loker: The issue is a bit complex. There is base funding, there is one-time money from last year that we did not fully spend, then there is one-time money that came this year, some of which is earmarked. He said it would be difficult to be more specific without the actual figures before him, but could verify that there are both one-time funds and a significant amount for adding sections to serve graduating seniors. The example, given, however for adding sections to make a course every semester, that would probably require base funding.

Watkins: I don't see a mechanism, I see some money, and I see something we can do that costs money to meet this goal, but I don't see any way to access that money.

Loker: The way that this was handled last year was by sort of a proposal process and now we are repeating that process. He admitted a certain awkwardness in the process last year and the would like to see graduation initiative going through the regular allocation channels, but it looks like the approach this year will be similar to last year. There will be team of people who will inform the campus what money is available. These teams will assess and attempt to meet the needs that come before them as effectively as possible. They try to be as transparent as possible and get the money allocated so as to get results.

Ferrari: Noted that one concern emerging from the constituencies is that they seem to feel with regard to transparency there has not been an official forum for that discussion. When we are discussing curriculum design,

that RFP belongs to an even busier discussion. She voiced a concern that it may be November before these questions can be asked, and while we should focus on the discussion about curriculum redesign and how we are going in different ways to and apply funding, the budget decisions belong to UBC, but the overall questions about process belong to Senate. She would like to officially recommend that we do add this to Senate discussion.

Boyd: Requested that we try to find a way to get faster than that November timeline, perhaps the Executive Committee could work on the logistics issues and inform the Senate. She too has heard concerns about the ways we process graduation initiatives. She noted that last year was crazy, and given the knowledge that there some flexibility in the allocation of some of these graduation initiative dollars available, this year perhaps we can be more strategic in how we move forward this year in the process part of it. Maybe there is a way that a sub-curricular body really looks strategically at how an RFP like could meet the Mission of the Chico campus. While we have an amazing model from San Francisco there may be ways that fit Chico better and we could look at our process to help it move along a little faster.

Loker: I would be happy to come and talk to EC about the graduation initiative funding.

Boyd: I think Greg's point is who and where and what are the ways and mechanisms in order to tap into certain funds that would really help us, and who is making decisions about the non-earmarked funds and how those are being allocated. There are concerns about an ad hoc body that has been formed and doesn't really operate under any of our current existing structures.

Ferrari: Another question would be do we have any data that shows how much that needle is moving? Is there any way to compare for let's say an outreach effort to adding sections to engineering? If we need to move the needle how are we going to accomplish that? If we could discuss that, I think that is more a discussion for EC and Senate than UBC.

Loker: The graduation initiative is high on the priority list, speaking from the perspective of the Chancellor's Office; I know they have reorganized the Chancellor's Office around student success, the graduation initiative. I think that the more people on our campus, and particularly faculty, understand the rationale and the urgency behind the situation, the better we will be. What the best mechanisms are for both communication and inclusion are kind of open questions. Obviously the Academic Senate plays a critically important role for both of these functions. You represent constituencies; you go back and talk to your colleges and colleagues. I would really urge people if you're not familiar with it to look at that plan because that is the document that is guiding decisions. He directed interested parties to the graduation initiatives home page.

Boyd: So our short-term plan is posted online and our long-term plan is kept in house. She reviewed the developmental process on the short-term plan and noted that some of that is being incorporated into the long-term plan.

Loker: The long-term plan is significantly different from what we submitted previously; it really does reflect that feedback.

Wyrick (Academic Senate Chair): I was just thinking how rare it is that we get huge pots of money on this campus that we have the ability to figure out as a campus how to allocate. He observed that there is something amiss that this process has been so discrete. There hasn't been very widely... there hasn't been a lot of buy-in. Just listening to this I realize that there is something not right here; we have the opportunity to have a whole campus involved in thinking about this. Moving forward how can this be amended? I think Ferrari intends to discuss this as an item for Senate next Thursday, but think about what that discussion should look like. If we don't have UBC to think

about how we are allocating these funds, how can we make that a profitable discussion in Senate? I am open to any suggestions you may have how we can achieve a campus result where we are invested. He invited the group to write to him directly with their ideas or talk to the members of EC.

Allen: Asked if we should still apply for these funds even if we know that our work will not meet the January 30 deadline.

Ferrari: Responded that for 19-20 you can still target the fall deadline which is May 31.

Loker: Let me talk to Ferrari and the people in catalog. We don't want an RFP with no deadlines but we will try to get clarity on this question ASAP. He acknowledged that the May 31 deadline would still allow us to get something done this year. He further responded. "No," to a question about whether the application deadline is still Monday.

Ferrari: Summarized, to follow up then you will send an Email tomorrow to the effect that we are working on a modification.

Ferrari: Clarified that it went to Deans and Chairs, so the Email should inform those same people of the intent to modify. I don't see why we would not be able to get a document by the end of next week.

Loker: He agrees, and added that proposals already submitted will still be considered.

Boyd: To clarify we are submitting to the original network the information that there will be a revision and when that revision is done, we should also distribute to Senators and encourage Chairs to distribute to their department list.

Discussion ended

Ferrari concluded by thanking Loker for reminding us that we shouldn't be just checking boxes but we should think about the spirit of curriculum design that has broader goals than deadlines and funding. Which is the reason I wanted to provide these resources to you and your departments:

1. The list of all the presentations that were shared at the symposium in San Francisco about curriculum redesign.
2. A document about doing curricular change in a shared governance setting.

9. Other

Adjourn at 4:38

Respectively submitted,

Nanhee Kim