Meeting called to order at 2:35 PM

Chair Underwood reminds committee that this is the last meeting; to keep comments to motions

1. Approve minutes of 11/19/20 Approved

2. Approve with no changes

3. Ethnic Studies – Update/Discussion – Betsy Boyd
   • Implementation of legislative Ethnic Studies timeline (AB1460)
     Board of Trustees, CO, Academic Senate of the CSU working on how to include Ethnic Study as a grad requirement at the same time (ED Code/Title 5) -amended to make sure it is in line with AB1460
     • New area in GE -area F and reduced area D from 9 to 6 lower division and included 3 units in area F (this would not interfere with the total number of units in GE)
     • CAB has been working under the assumption that we would have an Area F
     • ASCSU wrote resolution asking campuses to not enforce Title 5 change but enforce AB1460 (last resolve of the first clause on the first page) Honoring faculty overview of curriculum
     • How would we gain support of our administration to sign an interim EM if we aren’t following the Board of Trustees proposal (Title 5)
     • United States Diversity Requirement is Chico State’s Own requirement
     • Will be implications if we do not follow Board of Trustees and require area F
     • Council on Ethnic Studies for CSU -formal disagreement on Board of Trustees implementation
     • Marianne would like an overlay instead of area F in GE
     • Tim -Ethnic Studies is to have the expertise in the four areas and is essential.
• Duncan -clarify US Diversity is local requirement, Betsy clarified it is currently and overlay and can count for US Diversity and another requirement. Is US Diversity not directly related to the new requirement and could double count. Betsy, very clear core competencies in Ethnic Studies and US Diversity would need to change. Area F is only the 4 focused groups
• Adam -would like them to be an overlay
• Jason -the idea of an overlay would still be a reduction to area D
• Alex -prefer it be its own separate course to keep the intent of the bill which is education on the 4 specific groups and an overlay may not have the same intended message.
• Betsy -curriculum in FASP is because of timing (Ex. Committee would like to rule on interim EM tomorrow, good for 6 months and renewed for 6 so potentially in affect for up to a year)
• Rachel -what is the opinion of the Chico State Ethnic Studies group. In favor of ASCSU
• Jason – chair has said he has not been consulted
• Rachel -will the Chico State group be consulted before a vote on the interim EM
• Betsy -will clean up consultation and there would not be a vote until discussion happen
• Betsy -clarify timeline for interim EM would only become interim if EC approves it. Tomorrow at EC this item will be discussed and go to full senate next week as discussion and a vote would happen by EC after senate. Verifying with Ethnic Studies if they still have the same position on the interim EM to provide to EC. Vote would happen after.

• CAB GE Proposal Options (1, 2, 3) Recent CAB correspondence and proposal summaries (see link)
  • Holly we need to know what needs to be communicated to incoming students. Catalog deadlines have passed.
  • Jason -operating under the assumption that interim EM has been approved and area F is implemented
    o Proposal 3 gets rid of USD which high unit majors may push for
  • Laura -was a discussion around climate justice included in proposal to include sustainability and get rid of USD
  • Betsy -sustainability EM authorizes serval subcommittees which includes a sustainability curriculum group. Could Laura’s comments around climate justice be directed to their group? CAB also had a recommendation for a name change for the green leaf courses.
  • Jason -Green Leaf proposal includes climate justice
  • Tim -Chair of curriculum subcommittee (campus sustainability) looking at the green leaf symbolism. Students want people to know if you graduate from Chico State you know about climate change, justice and other climate areas.

4. Proposed Digital Technologies in Teaching and Learning Policy EM 20-020 -Discussion item (3:00pm time certain – Chiara Ferrari and Kathy Fernandez
  • Policy is currently approved in an interim stage
  • Added a section on proctoring software
  • Added public information about the course
  • Revised language in academic integrity section to include faculty
  • Added WASC language in Sec. 4
  • Policy was taken to Ex. Committee of senate and they wanted FASP to review then bring back for action item
  • Questions that need to be address (see Chiara’s handout)
• Is there a process in place to make information available at the time of registration - Mike Allen says yes as long as the information is put into the course information with the new technology being rolled out for registration? Chiara clarified there is system but their needs to be a process/policy. Mike clarified there is a requirement to provide the information. Chiara stated that the policy is also bringing us in compliance with federal law. Free course materials also need to be included not just cost materials.

• Jeff - 2.2.3 a problem with faculty concerned they will prepare a class and then have to prepare differently if a student feels their privacy is in jeopardy. Are their platforms that are specifically threatening this could a list be provided so they aren’t preparing for classes twice or having to provide 16 different options. Concern with the last sentence as well. 2.3 feels as the impossible is being asked. What software will be put in place to achieve the same outcomes. Concern about privacy and equity data. Faculty wants to see the data about privacy, equity and accessibility. 4.3 Not understanding how the systems works. Faculty is not completely free to choose any system and should have clarification around accessibility and responsibility.

• Alexander -2.2.3 worded because of equity and privacy concerns.

• Duncan -2.2.3 specifically students have the right to not share their video. Feels strongly it needs to stay.

• Matthew Miller – everything people is saying about cameras is true but there are certain classes where interaction with the class/professor is the learning activity. For example, dance. They would not be able to teach if they do not see the student. Same with voice/singing. Lecture class it makes sense to keep it as a blanket statement but for specialty classes it does not work.

• Duncan agrees with dance example and suggests that maybe a statement in the syllabi regarding video. Maybe the policy should include “unless otherwise agreed upon.”

• Betsy – wants to make sure we respect someone’s examples and area of expertise and not debate it. Need to distinguish between having to be online and a student choosing an online course.

• Jennifer suggests reaching out to Matthew Miller’s department for feedback

• Alex - another privacy concern is recording and taking videos when not everyone is aware (on zoom). It can become a harassment issue. Agrees situational language may be good (with choice to no choice for online courses).

• Laura - Set a standard and use “whenever possible” language for other circumstances. 3.7 - would a student be required to surrender their intellectual property rights?

• Betsy - Proctorio exists for authentication. How do we make sure we can authenticate that the student enrolled is taking the test?

5. Subcommittees - information item

• FPPP – update on Spring 21 Tasks – Sistrunk (tentative)
  • Working on projects; adding to descriptions how FPPP relates to faculty, campus life.
  • 4 distinctions in the RTP process; Jeff Trailer had recommendations on how to look at those distinctions differently

• Targeted Harassment of Faculty (Faculty Cyberbullying) – (tentative)
  • Working arranging spring meeting schedule and setting agenda. Our goal last fall was to flesh out a resource document we’d inherited from 2019-2020 and to begin drafting the policy by the beginning of this semester. We have completed both of those goals.

6. Announcements
7. Other

8. Adjourn at 4:30pm