

## California State University, Chico Academic Senate

(530) 898-6201, Zip 020

To Mahalley Allen, Chair

Date: 12 Sept 2019

Kendall Hall 207, 2:30 p.m.

Members Present: Adamian, Allen, Altfeld, Bailey, Buffardi, Connolly, DeForest, Ford, Grassian, Gray, Gruber, Hammer, Horst, Lau, Medic, Miller, Paiva (Millard), Ramirez, Schartmueller, Seipel, Shepherd, Weidman, Widgay, Wyrick

Guests: Bowman (Peterson)

**Minutes:** taken by Heather Altfeld

Meeting commences at 2:31pm

### **1. Minutes from 29 Aug approved**

### **2. Agenda for 12 Sept approved**

### **3. Discussion of Secretary Schedule**

### **4. Information Item: Faculty-Led Curricular Design for Student Achievement in the CSU**

Presentation given by Kate McCarthy; BOX attachment provides further details for redesign of curriculum/curricular reform grants provided to six campuses. Discussion of role of EPPC as a significant part of offering feedback on the proposals. Mahalley Allen will serve on acting committee as well.

Kate McCarthy asked if those who have feedback can provide it within the next couple of days due to the impending deadline of the applications.

Chiara asked for inclusion of time frames on deliverables required for completion of the project.

### **5. Introduction Item: Ethnic Studies Graduation Requirement**

Allen began by discussing the history and background of the Ethnic Studies Requirement conversation, including the main discussions around the recommendations of the task force, the legislative response (and lack thereof). The main heart of the proposal is to include a 3-unit Ethnic Studies requirement for graduation from the CSU system, without adding to the graduation time for students.

One of the points of contention discussed was that curricular control should be decided by faculty and not the legislature. Ford clarified the debate with respect to legislative overreach and the Statewide Academic Senate vote, which was in favor of the requirement.

AB 1460 has already passed the first chamber (state assembly) of CA legislature. Current status is that it is held in a suspended state for two years.

Guest Faculty Sara Cooper spoke regarding the campus response to the Task Force, sharing that there is concern that proliferation of extant courses addressing injustice/race/gender/etc may actually be diluting the understanding of what Ethnic Studies means. A faculty member specifically trained/expert in Ethnic Studies would more clearly address other populations not currently being addressed in the GC requirement. Students could get through their entire degree without having learned about a population outside of their own demographic.

Process would involve CAB/Senate consultation and vote due to the shift in units. Ford spoke about wanting feedback from EPPC and the complexity of both designing core competencies and navigating what course in GE would be removed/replaced and the role of the state in terms of mandating the Ethnic requirement VS the local campus autonomy of doing the same thing. Ford notes that his perspective given the pulse thus far is that CSUC would like to act on the Ethnic Studies requirement with local control.

Cooper noted that there is a “failure of assessment” and a failure regarding the real thing students are supposed to get out of the diversity core competency.

The study of race/ethnicity specifically described focuses on Native American/African American/Asian American/Latinx Americans.

Further discussion of SLO’s with respect to what USD/UC currently addresses.

Cooper notes that we do have plenty of courses that would address the spirit of this bill. But the designation should only apply to courses that are being taught by faculty who are trained in the specifics of this discipline.

Question: Would we take away the USD status of courses that are NOT addressing the targeted Ethnic Studies populations?

Vice-Provost Grassian: Discussion of the subjectivity of how these determinations are and can be made. We have an opportunity to discuss and deliberate the USD requirement with a potential specific designation potentially more defined/narrowed.

Representative Wyrick notes that GE is already very set and we cannot really subtract courses; we would need to work with designations in existing courses. The concepts of race/ethnicity are contentious in terms of who is included.

Representative Maas: We could not designate an Ethnic Studies requirement in GE unless it is mandated by the Chancellor’s office.

Potential sanctions if bill passes and individual campuses do not mandate the requirement:-- Budgetary implications

Representative Wyrick noted that the four groups targeted are too narrow; e.g. that Jewish Studies is not represented.

Grassian: None of these terms are totally objective; even within these fields/disciplines, there are subjective views on which might comprise “cultural studies” vs “ethnic studies.” Further, more focus on learning objectives would solidify and articulate the goals for the courses offered and which would count.

**6. Introduction Item: Degree Designation Change from BA to BS in Communication Sciences and Disorders** (presented by Suzanne Bonneau Miller).

Council on Clinical Certification (the primary accrediting body) will be requiring that students applying for certification following graduation from a master's program particular science knowledge standards. Miller noted that among other similar programs in the U.S., overwhelming number are BS programs than BA programs (i.e., all CSU's are BS programs). Miller clarified that the BA/BS status change would not shift the candidacy requirements for students desiring to enter MS program.

There are not added requirements to this particular suggested change. There is a small degree of flexibility for transfer students who may have taken courses slightly outside of the course requirements.

Lab component is extant in many of the current offerings within this particular degree.

Representative Maas clarifies that both BA and BS are Title 5 compliant.

Vice Provost Grassian discussed the fact that differences between BA/BS and the required courses may need more "distinguishing" factors.

Allen called for a vote. Item passes with unanimous vote.

**7. Introduction Item: MA to MS in Communication Sciences and Disorders** (also presented by Suzanne Bonneau-Miller)

Three primary reasons: The field requires these science requirements, thus degree program ought to as well. Miller clarified too that the Dept. has already made significant changes in the last ten years. The MA is not as appropriate as an MS given the specific science requirements that have already been established within the field. The prerequisites for entrance in this program are among the proposed changes.

Further, of the 17 total programs statewide granting Master's degrees in CSD, approx. 60% are MS programs; nationally 72%.

Representative Wyrick asked if it was possible to create a combined/accelerated program with BS to MS. Miller noted that it is difficult to do, given the knowledge requirements for students, and noted that more likely is the idea of a 3-year master's program. Also notes that the high requirements for acceptance in the Master's programs (12-16% acceptance rates) and that many undergrads will not actually go on to work in the field or be accepted to Master's programs. The idea here is that the BS would be more of a "stand-alone" BS degree.

Allen noted that the catalog copy vs proposal: discrepancy in required science courses. Miller clarifies that informally, dept has been clear with students on the requirements for entrance. Also a need for listing the three primary reasons as well as standards when, if this passes, it comes to EPPC as an action item.

Miller confirmed that there would be no discrepancies with accrediting bodies, that too much is at stake.

Vote: Passed as an introduction item unanimously; will be revised and revisited in two weeks.

## **8. Introduction Item: New Graduate Degree Program, Master of Arts in Teaching, presented by Debbie Summers.**

Chair Allen inquires that if MA in Teaching and MA in Education are different, why do they have the same learning outcomes?

Summers discusses that these programs target different audiences entirely, but the elemental objectives are very similar in terms of the content. MAT more applied and significant for those who want to teach and be compensated for their expertise within teaching; MAE is more oriented toward candidates who would want to be administrators, etc. It was noted that it seems critical to have distinct learning outcomes between the two programs. Summers notes that this has been discussed at the departmental level and it would have to be mediated at that level as well. VP Grassian confirms that the nuances do in fact need to be articulated; the PLOs are really important for student understanding of expected outcomes, even if the core competencies are similar.

Potentially there was a rectifiable error in the slide.

Representative Adamian explains that students are taking shared core classes (whether credential and MAT or MAE); Summers adds that there are distinctions between credential learning outcomes vs MAE learning outcomes, depending on path taken by degree candidate. Culminating activities/requirements are different. Seipel explains that federal funding guidelines require that a MAT is available to students. Clarifies that some of the credential programs would actually be transferable (state to state). Summers notes that there are specialized directions students can take at grad coordinator discretion. But intention of degrees is significantly different.

Federal guidelines stipulate that more highly qualified teachers need to be granted degrees which in turn requires that we have the MAT program.

Representative Adamian recommends that the PLO's get revised so that the differentiation is clearer.

Representative Paiva raises the question of financial differences that would arise if this federal recommendation is not addressed? Summers discusses the ways that it makes students more competitive, and that we do risk millions of dollars a year if we do not pass it. Clarifies that this money goes to help students directly while they are in the MAT program.

Introduction Item passes unanimously with the stipulation that distinctions are added to the PLO's.

Meeting adjourned at 4:39 pm