



M E M O R A N D U M

Members present: Adamian, Akinwande, Allen, Altfeld-Fisher, Connolly, Ferrari, Ford, Hammer, Horst, Hostetter-Lewis, Kim, Maas, McConkey, Medic, Mitchell-Brown, Paiva, Peterson, Rovai, Shepherd, Stapleton (Grassian), Watkins

1. Approve minutes for March 7, 2019

Additional notes by Nicole were added.

Suggest to change “Febrbruary” to “Ferbruary” and to delete one “r”.

The minutes were approved.

2. Approve agenda for March 28, 2019

The agenda was approved with no change.

Before starting with next item new EPPC member has joined the Committee and current members introduced themselves.

3. Action Item: Minor in Musical Theater Dance (Name Change)

Guest presenter: Megan Zollinger

The proposed change is “Minor in Musical Theater” to “Minor in Dance”.

- Although this item has been presented last meeting, voting has been postponed. New updated proposal has been presented in front of the EPPC today.
- Certain courses have been removed/added and this has been discussed and approved at the Department. As a result, THEA 302 and 354 have been removed and KINE 192 have been added as a substitute. KINE 113 has been added to improve and make stronger case for a new name change.
- Ferrari reminded EPPC members that we are discussing only a name change.
- Clean copy of a document has been added.
- EPPC member made a comment that procedurally we are changing the name. However, EPPC required them to made minor changes to courses. Although they were brought to EPPC last time, changes were made and that’s why we are discussing these today. The presenter mentioned that these curricular changes are minor and have been approved by both Department and College.
- New catalog 20/21 will have these changes recorded. Program changes paperwork is done and approved.
- The proposed is a name change from “Minor in Musical Theater” to “Minor in Dance”. The EPPC is ready to vote.

1. The action item was passed unanimously.
2. This will be on the Senate agenda as an introduction item next week (April 4).

4. **Action Item: Certificate in Literary Editing and Publishing-Reinstate (Guest presenter Peter Kittle)**

- Presenter said that English 220W was added as a request made by EPPC. This has been included in rationale so it is not a hidden item.
- This is a proposal to reinstate the Certificate in Literature Editing and Publishing. There were no questions. The EPPC is ready to vote.

1. The action item was passed unanimously.
2. This will be on the Senate agenda as an introduction item next week (April 4).

5. **Action Item: Office of International Education (name change) Guest presenter: Sara Trechter**

The current name is Office of International Education, the propose name change is International Education & Global Engagement.

- The presenter stated that Passport center is now open. Sarah Trechter encouraged EPPC members to send their passports to them.
- Ferrari asked what was the rationale to remove word “Office” as this is becoming more frequent practice.
- Trechter response: It became harder to find places when searching if a lot of them have the word “Office” in their names. This simplify the search and the way in which it can be found.

1. The action item was passed unanimously.
2. This will be on the Senate agenda as an introduction item next week (April 4).

6. **Action Item: Revisions to EM 18-005 General Education Program**

Guest presenter: Jason Nice

1. Ferrari stepped down from the Chair position due to a possible conflict of interest and Allen chaired this part of the meeting.
2. After the great discussion last week, the EPPC welcomed Jason Nice to present Revision to EM 18-005 General Education Program as an action item.
3. Substitute document has been added – Attachments 6c and 6d
4. Presenter made a comment that on page 4 of a substitute document there has been a change (text in red). As suggested by EPPC last time, this change has been made to be more specific regarding number of units for lower division courses. “In accordance with EO 1100, students take a **minimum of thirty-nine** ~~to forty~~ lower-division units in Subject Area A (English Language Communication and Critical Thinking, ~~nine units~~), Area B (Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning, ~~nine to ten units~~), Area C (Arts and Humanities, ~~nine units~~), Area D (Social Sciences, ~~nine units~~), and Area E (Lifelong Learning and Self Development, ~~three units~~).”
5. Page 5 follow the minor changes within Upper division paragraph removing number of units for each subject area, and instead of “300-level or 400-level” changing it to “upper division courses”.

6. The presenter stated that last change was made on page 10, "COB Curriculum Oversight Board" name was removed and text modified. This was a matter of oversight, there were issues, and in the future they will be reported at the higher level.
7. There is a Motion to accept the substitute document. It was second. Motion has been accepted by EPPC. Members of the EPPC started the discussion.
8. One of the members suggested an editorial change on page 4 of the substitute document for "AI" to be spelled as "American Institutions", and in continuation to add "to fulfill" in the same sentence. Motion to change the sentence was proposed as following: change "At Chico State, the following are offered to clear the AI requirement" to "At Chico State, the following are offered to fulfill the American Institutions requirement...". Second. EPPC voted and motion passed.
9. The following discussion was regarding "Administration of GE" section on page 9 that suggested a change in words. Sentence imply that a Pathway has a responsibility. Can we use different wording? If started with Pathway Coordinators that would make more sense. Assumption is that Pathway coordinator and GE minor coordinator should have the same responsibility. Suggested change: "Upper-division Pathways and corresponding GE Minors ~~are also responsible for~~ should maintain and demonstrate ~~maintaining and demonstrating~~ their intellectual coherence and breadth. Pathway Coordinators, in consultation with faculty teaching in the upper-division Pathways and corresponding GE Minors, will report annually to CAB on steps taken to maintain coherence and breadth and demonstrated student learning."
10. There was a Motion to change this sentence as stated above, second. EPPC voted and Motion passed.
11. Page 9 paragraph 1 suggested change: instead of "this committee will comprise..." to change it to "the committee membership will consist of...". Motion, second. Motion passes.
12. There has been a lot of discussion on voting memberships and representation. Having 8 members of HFA out of a total 18, and 3 from BSS means that they have a majority with total of 11 members. We should discuss that we all have a same representation. This will be another discussion at the Senate. Question for Jason: was this discussed at CAB? Jason confirmed it has been discussed few times, but not this year. In some years HFA and BSS having majority can be an issue.
13. Some members can not represent two constituents: either college or pathway coordinator but not both (by bylaws). That should be fixed by having "pathway coordinators should not be a college representative." on page 9 of a document.
14. Every faculty is eligible to represent a pathway and discipline area, but we may have a movement to have more representatives from one side compared to others. Discipline area A, B, C, D should have adequate representation, not each college. It was recognized that Dr. Pablo Cornejo joined CAB and his input was invaluable for STEM field.
15. There are two pathways - Science, technology & values and Sustainability pathway that should have more representatives from STEM field. One of the EPPC members asked if we can see a history of pathway coordinators in the past in STEM representatives? This may be a concern if we don't have an adequate representation for STEM. This EM doesn't answer this issue in this moment. Answer: "Although

- there is a concern, Chico State is aware of this, and they are making sure students have adequate options in STEM field.”
16. EPPC member: If faculty from these STEM colleges are not stepping up then how do we fix this problem? Obligation to provide these classes might be a problem for some Colleges, as we may be putting a lot of classes in GE that are offered not just for majors, but other students as well. Issue is finding funds and not having enough faculty to teach these courses. We must be strategic as this is a huge responsibility.
 17. Jason Nice said that CAB worked with each department, and especially with STEM departments, to make sure they can have a substitute classes instead of adding additional courses and more units to their pathways.
 18. As a reminder, Revisions to EM does not need to solve this issue right now, but this is a good discussion and we should continue to have it at different levels.
 19. Question was raised that instead of having Area representation why we don't have College representations? Answer: to have more equal representation from campus too e.g. library representative.
 20. Other issue was raised: workload to pathway coordinators. Compensation has been cut in half already this year. They will be advisors to minors. SLO assessment across pathways is overly complex and a great workload on coordinators ... so question was “Is there much change in workload” and the answer is “No”.
 21. Question: “Why compensation to coordinators is cut in half?” The original EM didn't specify release time. Now workload has increased. Provost make this decision. Cut went into the effect this year where the view was that workload was ½ of what was before due to the assumption that there is less work related to this position.
 22. Concern that workload issue is huge and this must be placed in front of Senate and Provost. We need to demand the explanation on what is a rationale for cutting?
 23. Page 3 of clean copy: “Normally, students may not use an upper-division course for GE credit unless they have completed at least forty-five semester units prior to enrolling in the course.” How does this affect engineering students or other taking already 45 units completed before they are allowed to take upper division courses. EO 1100 says it was 60 units, but this original 45 units has always been 45 units. Explanation: 60 units of lower division completed before being allowed to take upper division. This 45 units is in the time of enrollment so the idea is that students are registering “in progress to complete 60 units”.
 24. Amendment to a document (page 5) made by EPPC member: “Students enrolling in upper-division GE courses shall have completed required lower-division GE courses in written communication, oral communication, critical thinking, and mathematics/quantitative reasoning.” Motion, second. Direct response: “Current areas do not have response to these changes.” Question: “How will this be enforced?” EO says “shall”, which is not specific if and how it will be enforced.
 25. Questions and discussion continued: There are some Upper division GE courses that do not have pre-requisite. We need to find a way to enforce pre-requisites for lower division courses in order to enroll students in 300 and 400 level courses. This will have more impact on students, Departments and Colleges when they are planning course taking under specific pathways. This is a major concern and should be discussed further.

26. Another question “Will we have many students held to get register for classes and will they be able to finish their Degree on time?” Answer “Probably. This will not be able to input in smart planner and may slow down their progress. Could we write currently enrolled and planned to complete by the time student starts the next course? EO is not currently clear on that.
27. EPPC member suggested that one option can be we don’t revise this EO and we hope it will be resolved in the future at the higher level. Procedure should not be different as we are not breaking this EO. We can administrate it in the same way.
28. Follow up question: “Will any course count as double count? Will that also stop the students’ progress? Could we overwrite that for individual student? Can we enlist them but not enforce?” Answer “Yes, that can be done.” Level of preparation should be there when student is stepping into 300 level class by taking pre-requisite classes in order to be successful in upper division courses.
29. Motion was made to add a sentence at the end of a Upper-Division Pathways paragraph on page 5. Second. “Students enrolling in upper-division GE courses shall have completed required lower-division GE courses in written communication, oral communication, critical thinking, and mathematics/quantitative reasoning.” EPPC voted. With three no votes, motion has passed.
30. Discussion continued. Allen asked question regarding complementary courses on page 3 of a document. “How many are allowed in lower GE? Can any course be offered?”. Jason Nice answered: “If they are offered every semester, there is no limit.” Follow-up question: “If we have courses and they don’t complete that “complementary course” definition will they be kicked out?” Jason Nice: “If they are complementary course, they will stay.”
31. EPPC member start the Motion for text on page 9, second bullet to add word “not voting” next to pathway coordinators. “Pathway Coordinators - Pathway Coordinators receive release time for overseeing the coherence and breadth”. Idea of this would be to have enough College representation with this change. EPPC member: “Will CAB approve this considering representation? HFA people in CAB might not agree at all. Concern that this will be approved by 8-9 people. Concern that they can not vote as their own pathway coordinators. There should be more discussion to it, as this is a more complex topic.”
32. Motion to change sentence “Upper-division Pathways and corresponding GE Minors are also responsible for maintaining and demonstrating their intellectual coherence and breadth” to “Upper-division Pathways and corresponding GE Minors should maintain their intellectual coherence and breadth.” Second. EPPC vote: Yes: 9; Opposed 10. Motion fails. EPPC concludes this is a good and important discussion, and it must be continued.
33. There were no further questions. EPPC voted on a document - Action item Revisions to EM 18-005 General Education Program.
34. For Senate we should have final clean copy and final changed copy of this document.

1. The action item was passed unanimously.
2. This will be on the Senate agenda as an introduction item next week (April 4).

7. Announcements and Other

1. Take a look at the exhibit at the Kendall hall. These are pictures of faculties and students with important messages.
2. Check the email for “Tuesday teaching tips”. There are three workshops that will be offered, please attend. This will allow you to get the Certificate in “Measuring Student Learning and Success”, and include it into RTP. The topics will include how to create an assessment plan, how to apply this assessment to a course, how to include that evidence in RTP. A series of three workshops will be on April 5, 12, and 19 in MLIB 252 from 11-12:30.

8. Adjourn (4:14 pm)

Respectfully,
Ana Medic