

Present: Adamian, Allen, Altfield, Bailey, Buffardi, Connolly, DeForest, Ford, Grassian, Gray, Gruber, Hammer, Horst, Hostetter-Lewis, Lau, Medic, Miller, Paiva (Millard), Peterson, Ramirez, Schartmueller, Seipel, Shepherd, Wigday, Wyrick

Absent:

Guests: Michael Allen, Armitage, Bohn, Click, DiMaggio, Hajimorad, Moreno-De La Cerda , Snyder, Watkins

1. Approve Minutes

No comments. Approved.

2. Approve Agenda

Welcome to Ella Snyder and Welcome Back to Tawnie.

We don't have the same bandwidth to continue looking at the GE minors. So the executive committee decided to post-pone these discussions until the Fall.

Ford - EM 19-021 in response to postponement of discussion of GE minors.

Move to add new item 6: Revision to EM 19-021 as an introduction item.

Moves Items 7, 8, 9 to 8, 9, 10.

Wyrick

Motion Passes – Yes: 16 constitutes majority of voting members.

3. Intro Item: Significant Change to BS in Sustainable Manufacturing

Greg Watkins provided a brief overview of the history of the department and program. About ten years ago they were facing enrollment and budget challenges. They revamped the program and changed it from Industrial Technology to Sustainable Manufacturing. Now covers some outdated technologies and at the height of the program. Now has struggled to attract majors. Dropping from around 100 majors at height to a current number around 40. Manufacturing has changed dramatically over the last ten years. Advanced manufacturing is a new field using robotics and purpose-built machines. Modern manufacturing is quite high tech. there's a huge demand for these jobs heading into the future combined with a lack of qualified people to hold those jobs. They completely redesigned the program to keep the important elements and modernize it moving forward.

From Chat: From Jennifer Gruber-EPPC : I polled our International Admissions folks and International Advisors and they all said there would be interest from prospective international students for this degree.

Senator Ford shared that consultation about the new math course in the proposal took place with the Department of Mathematics and Statistics and that the department is satisfied with the course and there are no conflicts.

Senator Grassian shared that he and the Provost agree that this is an exciting program. Asked if the program had the opportunity to survey student interest.

Watkins shared that there is also planning of a minor related to this program that isn't ready to share with EPPC yet. Shared some anecdotes about current students and recent grads that are positive about the prospect of these program updates. An advisory board member also expressed interest in hiring graduates of this program.

Grassian asked if it would not be accredited as a new program. Watkins shared that the current program is already accredited and they touched bases with their accrediting body and the body shared that the existing accreditation would be extended one year to get this new program up and running before a new accreditation visit and the program does not anticipate any interruption to their accreditation.

Grassian has a whiny cocker spaniel.

Grassian asked if there would be a significant future need of financing for technology and equipment. Watkins shared that that is already the case for almost all programs in the college.

Grassian expressed concern about the number of major units changing from 90 to 93. In particular, was interested in the rationale for the requirement of each new course. Also mentioned that requiring increased units could interfere with the goal of increasing enrollment.

Watkins reminded the committee that the 120 units required of the major would remain the same. He explained the rationale relative to the value of the courses with respect to student outcomes and employer desires, using some specific examples and explaining how it could weaken the major. For example, he pointed out the plastics course and pointed out that it still makes up a large portion of the manufacturing field and replacing or removing a course like that from the program would leave graduates less prepared for the reality of their field. Additionally, they met with alums in the industry and listed courses and content that these graduates said they had felt were missing from their undergraduate programs.

Senator Hammer asked about the choice to require Econ 102 and 103. Watkins explained the relevance of these course to the program and professional field. Shared that he also spent some time with CAB Chair Jason Nice to make sure that the program appropriately accounted for GE requirements.

Grassian suggested that the proposal would be stronger if the rationale that Watkins shared for including the added classes were included in the proposal.

Watkins also noted that there are a number of prerequisite chains that also make it difficult to remove, as requirements, any classes without causing additional problems.

Ford asked how many GE courses are usually waived in a typical engineering program.

Watkins explained some of the waivers and substitutions that you see in engineering programs. Some of the GE requirements are met through major requirements. There are some waivers. But this program has one less waiver because an additional course is met by a major requirement.

Ford pointed out that this still has fewer overall units required than some of the other engineering programs.

Move to approve as introduction:

Yes: 21

No: 0

Pass

4. Intro: Name Change from BS in Sustainable Manufacturing to BS in Advanced Manufacturing and Applied Robotics

Watkins explained that the rationale is that the new name should be more appealing to prospective students. The program deals with a fair amount of content in the area of robotics, so it seemed appropriate to include this in the name.

Doris noted that the rationale really only addressed the advanced manufacturing part of the rename, but not the applied robotics. Suggested that Watkin's explanation about the applied robotics part of the title be included in the rationale as well.

Watkins explained that the CO was initially against the name change because of the "Advanced" but that they added a significant amount of rationale to support the proposal. This is why this was included in the rationale, but not the applied robotics part.

Wyrick asked if the Chancellor's Office approved the name change or does this need to go to the board of trustees. He wanted to know where they were in this process.

Watkins clarified that the name change will proceed to the Chancellor's Office.

Gray explained that the CO appeared inclined to approve it even though they didn't state so explicitly. Grassian concurred. He added that the addition of more rationale appeared to help, but that the Chancellor's Office could still ultimately fail to approve it.

Wyrick pointed out that from the Chancellor's Office's perspective, this sort of acts as a new major because this major name doesn't currently exist. Watkins pointed out that this doesn't cause additional proliferation of degree titles because the major as it is currently named only exists on our campus.

Mahalley Allen suggested some additional comments in the proposal about the applied robotics.

Vote: Yes – 21
No – 0

5. Intro: Name Change from Department of Mechanical and Mechatronic Engineering and Sustainable Manufacturing to Department of Mechanical and Mechatronic Engineering and Advanced Manufacturing

Greg shared that 'Advanced Manufacturing' was more appropriate to the actual content of the program. The abbreviation MMEM will not change.

No additional discussion.

Vote: Yes – 23
No – 0

6. Discussion of Revision to EM 19-021

The revision is to change the text items referring to the implementation year of 2021 to instead state 2022.

Wyrick wonders why it is called an 'Addendum' instead of an 'Appendix'.

Ford moves that we make the changes:

Paiva seconds.

Jason Nice, Chair of CAB, sent a message stating his support for Rick's motion.

Rick suggests that we open discussion next meeting during action as to whether "Addendum" should be renamed an "Appendix". Suggests that we vote on this as it

is presented as an introduction item, then discuss further at action in the next meeting.

Vote: Yes – 21

No – 0

7. Discussion: Alternative Grading Options for Spring 2020

Michael Allen provided another overview of this discussion of alternative grading options as discussed in the prior Senate meeting.

25% of survey respondents said No Change

31% of respondents said CR/NC

22% of respondents said ABC/NC

N=478 respondents.

Fresno suggested NC assigned to all F's for this semester. Plus students can petition to change B/C to CR or D to CR.

From chat: From Jennifer Gruber-EPPC : FYI on Fresno State Policy:

Exclusive to spring 2020, Fresno State will replace all grades of an F with a “no credit” grade (NC). The F grade will be removed from all grade rosters and will be replaced with a NC. In addition, undergraduate students will be allowed to petition to switch B and C grades to a “credit” grade (CR). Students who earn a D can petition to switch the grade to a NC. Graduate students will be allowed to petition to switch B grades to CR. Letter grades, C and D, can be switched to NC. These options will be made available to students beginning on Monday, April 27, and will end on Tuesday, May 26. Exceptions to this deadline may be allowed by the registrar on a case-by-case basis.

Buffardi pointed out that the majority chose the opt-on options. Shared a comment from the survey that students that might most need to opt-in might be least likely to know to do it, which is a concern.

Wyrick really likes the option where NC's are automatically assigned to F's. Wonders if it is possible to go with this option while students can still opt-in to CR/NC as well.

Michael Allen shares that Jed's idea is totally doable. EM 1018 says that courses taken at Chico for CR/NC can only be taken as elective credits. Cannot apply to GE or Majors. Some other CSUs have already done this.

Altfield – Is survey still open? Ferrari – Technically, but we need a decision by tomorrow.

Snyder – Has been meeting with students for feedback. Students would prefer to opt in to CR/NC. The students also shared that they were concerned about the need for these courses to still be applicable to degree or major.

Ford asked about what students were aware of in terms of options available.

Snyder shared that students wanted to be able to exercise their own control over the grade and not have things be too confusing.

Ford asked Michael about the golden four. Would this be in violation of EO 1110? Or will we need a change in the EO for us to be able to apply this policy to the golden four.

Michael Allen explained that the Chancellor's office will likely exempt this semester from some of the applicable EOs.

Bailey wonders if option 4 is better option as it seems that the other options may lead to some detrimental consequences that the students don't fully understand.

Snyder shared that students are concerned about not getting A's due to the circumstances and this affecting GPA and the affects that result from that.

Bailey shared that this seems to support Wyrick's recommendation that multiple options are available to support students ability to still receive CR via either opt-in or by petitioning if they receive a B/C as Fresno is doing.

Armitage clarified that F's hurt GPA, but NCs don't. While NCs also can be detrimental applying to some graduate and professional schools, even then Fs probably still look a little worse.

Paiva pointed out that regardless of the policy that is implemented, it still isn't possible to make this a required blanket policy applied to all departments due to differences in accreditation processes and major program policies.

Grassian points out that Fresno is allowing students to change to CR/NC after grades are submitted. The CO has shared that they would not like campuses to do this even though they can. Part of the concern is that this wouldn't be equitable for graduating students because they couldn't receive the same benefits.

Armitage shared that this could impact degree reporting, but could, in theory, be possible.

Ferrari also shared that it seems that automatic NCs for Fs is good with the option in place to petition.

Snyder shared that this actually seems reasonable relative to student concerns. The main concern raised was that students were worried about not having the option to change the Bs and Cs.

Paiva shared that an option like option 4 helps deal with the problem that the students most likely to need the option of NC are least likely to opt-in.

Gruber shared that students with whom she spoke thought that the deadline date should be at about the earliest possible. Also that they wanted to have the control of opting in. But also liked the idea of all Fs turning into NCs.

Ford reminded that the only paperwork of petitions would only be for those changing Bs and Cs. The use of a petition could be use to facilitate communication with departments to help avoid department-specific conflicts.

Wyrick shared concern about whether or not we are hearing the voices of all students or just a subset of students that communicated with AS.

Wigday shared that this was discussed in AS as well and that the conclusion was that having the power to opt in is the most equitable solution. Would not be in favor of option 4 if students didn't have an option to deal with Bs or Cs.

Paiva reiterated that there is no one-size-fits all fix to this issue so regardless of how we go, this will be problematic. Mahalley Allen summarized that this means we would need departments to be looped into this process.

Ramirez agrees with Wigday.

Ferrari is concerned that option 2 actually isn't that equitable because we have to account for the fact that not all students are properly advised and that they may inadvertently make a more detrimental decision.

Bailey shared that it sounds like if we choose option four with Fresno's option for Bs and Cs, then it addresses the student concerns and potentially mitigates some of the problems facing departments. This potentially leaves more letter grades on transcripts that will mean fewer problems with students receiving CR for major courses. It changes the timing as well so that students don't have to take a gamble on their grades early.

Ford reiterates that the struggling students that had to go home and face more struggles in this situation are the ones least likely to be able to know the options available, what avenues they have to advocate for themselves, and yet they are the most likely to need these sort of options.

Snyder asked if it is possible to require that departments have to accept CRs for their major.

Ferrari shared that if we went with option 2, it would be very difficult to ensure that this was adhered to by all departments across the campus.

Hostetter shared that if we went with option 2, the Nursing program would have problems if they could not opt out.

From Chat: From Rick Ford-EPPC: From the Fresno model: "Please note, an academic department will be able to request to opt out of the above-explained arrangement for specific classes. To opt out, the department shall write a memo explaining the reason the class should not permit CR/NC. The request will be evaluated by the dean, who will then send it to the provost for final approval.

From Chiara Ferrari : @Rick: I still think that since this option is the most "accommodating" there might be less requests

From Kevin Buffardi-EPPC : Agreed with the advocates for the Fresno model. With the petition option, it gives students the agency that Ella, Amanda, and Alejandro shared are important to students.

Click shared that having a way to extend the window for students to be required to make this choice to allow students to have some time to clear their heads after dealing with the challenges of this particular semester.

Armitage shared that this is possible to extend grade changes to a later date so long as the degree has not already been awarded.

Click notes that it might help students feel more empowered if we clearly and proactively communicate to students what their options are.

Paiva shared that extending grade change paperwork to after May 22nd would be an issue in terms of contract. Foresees that this will be a concern of the Provost.

Grassian seeks clarification on what "petition" means in Fresno's context and, if it requires approval, why.

Armitage noted that the current procedure for changing grades requires instructor, chair, and dean signatures.

Armitage shared that if they can opt-in to change their B/C to a NC, then there would be no need for a petition. Maybe there is a need to make a distinction between "opt in" and "petition".

Lau reminds that these choices can have longer term ramifications if, for example, in the Fall we are still only able to provide online education.

Wyrick is it possible to let faculty submit a letter grade without knowing whether or not the student is receiving CR/NC.

Armitage explains that this is the current structure.

Buffarci notes that a petition process helps facilitate consultation with departments.

Grassian concurs with Lau that we should also be aware of the possibility, however remote, that we could have similar issues in the Fall so we should consider that this can possibly be something that might have even longer lasting effects.

Mahalley Allen is going to bring the suggestion to EC that we think that CR should replace Fs and that students should be provided an opportunity to choose to change B/C to NC if so desired.

From Chat: Kara Maas-EPPC: I apologize, it took a while to find this, but in response to what Rick mentioned before about grades and the Golden IV. This is the response from the CO in regards to transfer students where they are allowing CR/NC grades for Golden IV coursework.

<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/hn/documents/csualmissioncovid19impact.pdf>

Paiva voiced a concern that there should be an option for departments to opt out. Rick agreed.

Mahalley shared a memo from Sharon Barrios, Dean of Graduate Studies. Memo stated that most graduate coordinators were opposed to changing grading policy at all at the graduate level.

Ferrari shared that the survey results showed that a substantial majority of respondents believed that a change in grade policy should apply to both undergraduate and graduate programs and that this is in opposition to the graduate council's position.

Chiara shared that option 4 seems to be the best option to address the concerns voiced by Grad Council after speaking with Barrios. This doesn't really change the effects of receiving a grade of A, B, or C, but allows students that fail to receive an NC instead and is less of an obstacle to program completion.

From chat: From Jennifer Gruber-EPPC : Full wording on email from Fresno State on opt out:

Please note, an academic department will be able to request to opt out of the above-explained arrangement for specific classes. To opt out, the department shall write a memo explaining the reason the class should not permit CR/NC. The request will be evaluated by the dean, who will then send it to the provost for final approval.

Departments may have some classes opt out for the following possible reasons:

1. A course is tied to a credential program.
2. A course is tied to a licensing board that requires students receive grades.
3. A course is part of an accredited program that requires students receive letter grades.

If a department does not opt out, a grade of CR in a major course would count toward completion of that department's major requirement, as a one-time exception for spring 2020.

Horst shared, from his perspective as a graduate coordinator, that he thinks we should support whatever option provides the most flexibility for a program to meet the needs of their governing/accrediting bodies.

Mahalley Allen shared that her conclusion is that we would like graduate programs to have flexibility and that option 4 provides the most flexibility.

Miller asked about the timeline for a decision. Mahalley Allen noted that we are having a discussion tomorrow in EC to make a recommendation to the President and that hopefully a decision will be made soon after.

Ford shared that he read in the Chancellor's memo that he would like to receive a decision from campuses by April 15th.

Ferrari knows that students are anxious about this and would like to hope for a decision as soon as possible.

9. Announcements

None

10. Other

None

Adjourn 4:47 PM.