

Tuesday, October 20, 2020, 9:00am, Zoom

Chair Lisa Tremain called the meeting to order at 9:05am on Tuesday, October 20, 2020, via Zoom Meeting ID: 99723322775; a quorum was present.

Members Present

Ramesh Adhikari, Jill Anderson, Taylor Bloedon, Matthew Derrick, Carl Hansen, Lucy Kerhoulas, Heather Madar, Steve Martin, Cindy Moyer, Mary Oling-Sisay, Clint Rebik, Cutcha Risling-Baldy, Maxwell Schnurer, Jenni Robinson, Lisa Tremain (Interim Chair), Mark Wicklund, Shawna Young, Rick Zechman

GEAR Chair: Jill Anderson

APC Chair: Maxwell Schnurer

Student Representative: Malluli Cuellar

Administrative Coordinator: Mary Watson

Curriculum Coordinator: Bella Gray

Chair Tremain first explained the discussions and work the committee will undertake today regarding agenda items 4, 5, and 7 are all things that she implored the committee to take back to their departments, programs, units, offices and have these items ready to have conversations with constituencies, and particularly with groups that they represent on the ICC. For example, if someone represents a college, then have those conversations in the college office.

Vice Provost Oling-Sisay reiterated it will be important for members to take back information because of the fact that they are representing constituencies and must take back information so there is no communication gap.

Chair Tremain further explained that she will rely on long-time members of the ICC to provide context and clarity around the items being discussed today. She noted she learned a new way to keep track of the conversation in the chat rather than relying on blue hands that she would like to try in the committee today. She explained if someone has something to add to the conversation, they put the word "stack," in the chat to indicate the comment will in effect, stack on the current conversation. She explained if someone has a question that might pull the conversation in another direction, then they indicate so by putting the letter "Q" into the chat. Finally, if someone needs to make a direct response to something in the conversation, they would put "DR" for "direct response," in the chat. This indicates they may want to point out something was inaccurate or if there is a different perspective or different knowledge to be shared.

Subcommittees Reports

GEAR: GEAR Subcommittee Chair Anderson reported that CDC colleagues joined their last meeting for a good conversation about how to handle the new GEAR classes in Curriculog, and they are also working on a message to send to faculty about handling those, other than that, the Student Learning Outcomes continue to move forward.

CDC – CDC Subcommittee Chair Kerhoulas reported the committee continues shepherding the program proposals and they want ICC input on two different specific GE proposals that have come through, and noted there will be more talk about that in agenda item 6.

APC – APC Chair Schnurer reported the APC has been working on cultural pieces of the Student Behavior policy, thanked the Dean of Students Office for additional training. See the Senate meeting report.

AMP – AMP Chair Tremain reported the subcommittee is working on the roadmap as part of the strategic plan for academics is continuing. The feedback form has closed and she and student representative Zane Eddy are analyzing that data and they will bring a full presentation to this body on the third. She noted the data seems to reveal the a level of saturation has been reached such that the next round of feedback gathering will focus on what is HSU not doing that it needs to do.

Approval of Minutes of the October 6, 2020 Meeting

Minutes of the October 6, 2020 meeting were approved via general consent.

Ethnic Studies Legislation / AB 1460

[FAQs](#)

[HSU Sense of the Senate Resolution](#)

[GE Breadth Requirements](#) and Area D concerns (discussion)

[Draft Executive Order](#)

[C.O. Cover letter](#) and [C.O. Feedback Form](#)

- What is ICC's coordinated communication/response to ES Implementation language from the C.O.?
- What systems or processes does ICC need to have in place to support the transition to ES Implementation on our campus by Fall 2021?
- How do we support programs impacted by potential changes in Area D?
- Other

Chair Tremain first invited Vice Provost Oling-Sisay, Professor Risling-Baldy, Professor Begay, Registrar Rebik, and Assistant Registrar Robinson and anybody who's been on the front lines of

communications around this legislation and the implementation of this legislation to chime in at any point by putting a “stack,” comment in the chat.

Chair Tremain noted for clarity that she has not been on the front lines of communication, but has been receiving information from different people in this group, Chair Virnoche, and Provost Capps. She briefly explained that there has been a short history of pushback against this implementation and the moves that the chancellor's office is making in terms of implementation, that as the AMP talked about in their discussion last week, and as came out in the Sense of the Senate Resolution that was approved in last week's Senate meeting, the chancellor's office has not, in good faith, and as required by law, consulted with the Ethnic Studies Council across the CSU, and actually made some moves at earlier in the summer to start to think about the implementation before the legislation was even signed.

She explained the bill itself and the CO's implementation plan are not saying the exact same things; the legislation is much more broad and of course, the CO's implementation plan is much more narrow. Nevertheless, the consultation step and some of the views coming from the content experts, the students, the people who were behind the grassroots movement of this ethnic studies legislation, have not been in good faith included in this process so there has been a lot of pushback from a majority of campuses, lots of Sense of the Senate Resolutions coming from various campuses that are very similar in language to HSU's.

Chair Tremain noted she wants to be clear with this group that the chancellor's office is writing the draft executive order and FAQs to say that there will be a new Area F as part of General Education, and that there will be three units reduced from Area D General Education. This, as she understands, is not the preference of the ethnic studies experts in the Council, so one of the things that's happening is now the chancellor's office is still ramming this implementation language forward and it's now starting to land on people's desks. She explained that over the weekend HSU had at least one faculty member completely panicking about the impacts of reducing Area D units on their specific program.

Chair Tremain concluded and asked for comments from others, noting she feels a great deal of concern that campuses are being forced to start to implement the chancellor's office's plan for a reduction in Area D in favor of adding this Area F.

Professor Risling-Baldy explained she was nominated and attended the meeting between the Chancellor's Office, the ASCSU, and the CSU Ethnic Studies Steering Committee and so was able to sit in on what became the important meeting about the implementation of this law. She noted that the law says very clearly that the CO' and the ASCSU is supposed to collaborate with the CSU Ethnic Studies Council; they don't actually use the language of “consultation,” they use the language of “collaboration,” and the CSU Ethnic Studies Council has been very clear that they are not being collaborated with. Rather, they are being told that this is how the Chancellor wants to implement this.

She explained they put together their own response document which includes Core Competencies and an implementation plan that makes it clear the CSU Ethnic Studies Council does not want an Area F requirement and does not want to reduce Area D. Professor Risling Baldy further noted this is one of the reasons they asked for support from campus University and Academic Senates, because they've been very clear that they don't want to take units from other programs, especially because there are programs which are often in allyship with Ethnic Studies programs.

She continued, noting that at the meeting the CO was clear that there's a standard set of steps that they take to implement laws. The current step is the draft executive order has been put out and the CO is asking for feedback from each campus, but the CO is also saying that anyone who wants to can submit feedback on the executive order. The HSU Ethnic Studies Council are coordinating to put together talking points of response to the executive order so that the HSU-ESC can present it to the University Senate and to anyone else interested, so that everyone is able to hear how the Ethnic Studies content experts on campus, those who see the impacts that it could have across campus, feel about the issue.

Professor Risling Baldy explained they don't know if the executive order will be published as drafted, or if they're going to change it based on comments. She reported there is confusion surrounding the published FAQ document, since the publishing of FAQs is not on the normal list of steps, and everybody's all confused because it says things in there that we have not agreed upon. She reported the CO responded to the confusion by stating that the FAQ is a guiding document that can change based on feedback.

Next she explained the ASCSU is going to be meeting in November where they have to decide if they're going to adopt the revised Core Competencies that the CSU Ethnic Studies Council submitted and whether they're going to adopt the implementation plan that they made in collaboration with the entire ethnic studies council. She noted the Ethnic Studies Council represents every single professor in Ethnic Studies in the CSU system, and all 55 people who collaborated across all CSU campuses to write this document, and about 73 people voted unanimously to adopt the document. If the ASCSU decides to adopt the CSU-ESC's document, then they have to turn around and revise the ones that are listed in the FAQ, and on the website.

She noted the CSU-ESC are hoping to meet with ASCSU representatives to explain why they revised it as they did and why the implementation plan looks as it does. She noted the plan states clearly that we do not want to take from Area D and we want Area D to be offered as both lower and upper division options and not just a lower division requirement. Professor Risling Baldy concluded by encouraging anyone who is concerned about what the reduction of Area D and inclusion of Area F units would do to their program, department, college, or major, to draft a response detailing the impacts such an action would have.

Chair Tremain thanked Professor Risling-Baldy and restated for clarity, she understands that the CSU-ESC's stance is that it doesn't make sense for campuses to have a coordinated response for how they would implement an executive order that is not officially an executive order, and that campuses need to wait and hear whether the ASCSU will adopt the revised Core Competencies and Implementation Plan that the CSU Ethnic Studies Council has put forward to them.

She noted that if the ICC does draft a coordinated response, it should be giving feedback to the CO and explained that the last bullet point on the agenda today allows for a discussion if the ICC does want to get a group together to write a coordinated response.

Vice Provost Oling-Sisay underscored the need for ICC members to take notes on this issue back to their departments and constituencies because people are freaking out. She noted that campuses don't want the law to talk about implementation, indeed, if it did, faculty should all be outraged. She noted as Professor Risling-Baldy said, the law simply states that the CSU needs to collaborate with the CSU ESC to come up with parameters for implementation. She contextualized that another piece the CSU is wrestling with is the fact that they don't want to add another three units to the 120 units required for graduation. She explained perhaps this is why they're coming up with another Area (Area F), but noted that campuses cannot make decisions about a curricular process or a curricular undertaking without an executive order. She reiterated the need for communication but cautioned that everyone needs to communicate calm, while the collaborative process take place, and explain that these are all essentially working documents in the absence of a new Title V amendment and an Executive Order which necessitates a vote of the Board of Trustees.

Chair Tremain thanked Vice Provost Oling-Sisay for the reminder that this body doesn't have anything really to do right now other than get behind the Ethnic Studies faculty and Area D faculty.

Assistant Registrar Robinson explained that via her role on the CSU GE Advisory Committee (GEAC), she knows that it is true that they do not want to go over 120 units for graduation, and that the units were placed in GE due to the impact on transfer students and ADTs, because if each campus is doing its own version of this requirement then the question becomes how will the CSU make sure of reciprocity across the system so that students can transfer within the CSU, and can participate and CSU fully online.

She asked if HSU didn't have the units in GE, then what is the proposal for how HSU would support transfer of credit, not just from Community Colleges to the CSU, but within the CSU itself, especially if there are lower and upper division courses. She also noted that she understands Title V has already been updated with the changes to Area D and the addition of Area F over the summer, when they had those preemptive discussions mentioned by Chair Tremain before the law was passed.

Assc Dir. Wicklund asked whether the Ethnic Studies Council has proposed an alternative to the three credit reduction in Area D, given the dilemma of the need to keep graduation requirement at 120 units.

Professor Risling-Baldy clarified that discussion has always landed on the idea of letting the campuses implement the requirement in a way that helps to support what the campuses have already been doing with their 120 units. For instance, if a campus already has some type of diversity requirement, then support through there; there have also been proposals in favor of leaving it outside of GE, so that then you can have it double counting and can have it work in a way that it's not adding courses or units. She noted she thinks one of the pushbacks about transfer credits is that by leaving it in GE, the CSU is pushing the requirement off to community colleges and communicates a message not in the spirit of the law.

Professor Schnurer returned to the initial request that Chair Tremain had for the committee, which was thinking about the strategic pieces of feedback. He noted some of the threads that have been discussed today are probably places that a coordinated feedback strategy could talk about, specifically the possibility of double counting. He continued, noting the possibility for small working groups to form to gather dedicated and targeted feedback exists in the college office, in the University Senate, among other places. He concluded, explaining strategy number one is picking some places to fit specific suggestions that the CO could think about, and make sure that they're in alignment with the Ethnic Studies Council.

Professor Risling-Baldy pointed out that if the CO keeps the same executive order that's been drafted, then they are not collaborating in good faith and basically lied, because what they said was, "this is very much a draft and we are looking for feedback on this and we're going to take everybody's feedback." She also noted that Shirley Weber, who passed the legislation, has been vocal in her support of putting the units into Area F, but also indicated that she defers to the expertise of the Ethnic Studies Council and content matter experts.

Chair Tremain proposed that the ICC use the scheduled time next Tuesday during that special meeting to talk through a coordinated response to the CO—due on November 2—and in that coordinated response, the ICC align with the broader core competencies and recommendations for implementation coming from the Ethnic Studies Council. In addition, she suggested they discuss what the plan for implementation would look like here at HSU, specifically addressing the idea of double-counting and the ideas others were mentioning. She noted this would allow for a targeted response as to why HSU doesn't agree with the current draft executive order coming from the chancellor's office.

Vice Provost Oling-Sisay cautioned the ICC not to go too far, because this thing could come back and it could look completely different regarding competencies and timeline, etc. She noted it's so important for HSU to be able to—in our own unique HSU flavor—tell the story of how this

requirement makes sense for students in ways that scaffold from the lower division to the upper division.

Consent Calendar:

Chair Tremain encouraged the committee to continue to go into Curriculog and look at what's there do a deeper dive into the decision making process. As a reminder, she noted the CDC reviews these proposals thoroughly discusses them thoroughly, and then puts them on consent calendar for our review when they feel like they're ready for this body to review. Chair Tremain asked for any objections or questions about the items.

CDC Subcommittee Chair Kerhoulas offered to share her deeper notes on any items and Chair Tremain noted the biggest items were the core requirements change for SED Education, as well as the other one which was carried forward from last time; Geology 334 and the wackiness of the prerequisite there but between the last meeting and this one Clint and the CDC did a lot of discussion and the MAP is really where the question landed and the registrar and the CDC agreed that they're at the MAP is accommodating what needed to be accommodated.

Professor Moyer explained she was the shepherd for both items, and noted the secondary ed item came from the CTC saying those who are working on a credential to be a principal need to focus on either elementary education or secondary education, rather than doing a little bit of both.

Professor Howe asked about the gallery practices item since she understood that the committee is in the midst of changing requirements for certificates, majors, and minors and what we currently have is not sufficient, and that that was all under revision. She asked if it would not be prudent for to wait for those questions to be answered.

Chair Tremain appreciated this question because it, works in parallel to the final agenda item which is regarding the process for when there are things that exist in the queue that are not that are existing under current policy; does the ICC review them under current policy or do we ask people to wait while we're revising policy, things like certificates majors minors, etc. She noted in this particular case, this is actually adding a particular disciplinary track and not a new certificate program.

Professor Howe noted that in the Psychology department, there are some proposals in the queue that have been there for over a year or two, but the dept hasn't gotten any feedback on them at all. She noted in the last meeting it was brought up that it's because of this Area D changing, but we've never gotten that official feedback. She opined the ICC needs to have a practice or at least discuss whether they are going to go through all the proposals and vote on them or if things are in flux, are we not going to vote on them?

Chair Tremain explained for example, existing proposals in Area G are in the queue right now are under a different kind of rubric or heuristic because we have approved new GEAR program

learning outcomes and are now moving toward student learning outcomes in assessment. She recommended that things that are in the queue that have to do with major new minor programs or certificates should be given due diligence as to what's in the queue and keep moving those through.

Professor Moyer pointed out that, according to the previous certificate policy, the museum and gallery practices doesn't meet the standards for what our previous definition of a certificate was, but they were grandfathered in since it was an already existing program.

Following discussion, the below consent calendar items were approved via general consent and will be forwarded to the University Senate for approval at its meeting on October 27, 2020:

[ENGR 410 - 20-929](#). The Engineering department is proposing to change ENGR 313 from being a pre-requisite to a co-requisite for ENGR 410 in order to decrease the time to graduation.

[ENGR 440 - 20-928](#). The Engineering department is proposing to change ENGR 313 from being a pre-requisite to a co-requisite for ENGR 440 in order to decrease the time to graduation.

[ENST 295 - 20-930](#). The ENST program is looking to replace the not currently enforced ENST major corequisite with a pre-requisite of ENST 120. The CDC and the program leader had an extensive discussion regarding the impacts of this proposal on transfer students (see the email exchange attached to the proposal in Curriculog) and agreed that the ENST 120 pre-requisite will allow the major to retain its scaffolded structure while also ensuring the availability of seats in ENST 295.

[GEOL 334 20-827](#). The Geology department would like to add GEOL 335 (Geologic Field Methods I) as a pre-requisite for GEOL 334 and add GEOL 435 (Geologic Field Methods II) as a co-requisite in order to improve student learning in the course. None of the courses are bottlenecks. **After further discussion between the CDC and the Registrar, an agreement that the current MAP accommodates the proposed change has been reached.**

[Museum and Gallery Practices Certificate - Change Concentration/Emphasis Requirements - 19-877](#). In collaboration with CNRS, the Art department would like to propose a new track in the Museum and Gallery Practices Certificate. Currently, the certificate has 4 disciplinary tracks (Art, Native American Studies, History, and Anthropology). The newly proposed track is in Environmental Sciences and Management. The change opens up an opportunity for students in CNRS, specifically the ESM major to gain the museum and gallery practices certificate with minimal additional classes outside of their major. The CDC reviewed the proposal and concurred that this proposal is in compliance with the existing University policies.

[Secondary Education - Change Core Requirements - 19-894](#). School of Education is requesting the changes below to the Secondary Education program in order to streamline the program's curriculum. These changes will result in the total number of units in the program dropping from 20 to 19.5, which (as confirmed with the HSU Credential Analyst) will not negatively impact the students' ability to obtain a teaching credential.

- [SED 714 - 19-888](#). School of Education proposes that SED 714 changes from 2.5 to 2 units, due to budgetary constraints. The content of the course will be truncated but the course description will

stay the same. This proposal formalizes the 2020/21 department work-around of offering this class as SED 701 selected topic class.

- [SED 743 - 19-890](#). School of Education proposes to merge SED 743 and 755 into one 3-unit class (743). This will not change the overall number of units these two classes are worth. This proposal formalizes the department's 3-yr long work-around of offering this class as SED 701 selected topic class and serves to streamline the curriculum for students. CDC discussed the question of a new class proposal and agreed that given that 743 will be absorbing 755, this proposal will work for course repeatability and equivalency purposes.
- [SED 755 - 19-891](#). Course deletion as its content will be incorporated into SED 743. See more above.

Discussion: 2020-21 HSU Program Program Review

ICC charge

Timeline (e.g. March 1, 2021 for Sp21 proposals)

Discuss process for collegial feedback on self-studies

Peer-review sub-committee membership

ICC faculty: Assign programs to review

Assoc. Dir. Wicklund explained a couple years ago the program review system was put on hold. Last year as self-studies began to be produced, we talked about our internal review system in ICC. The system that had debuted a few years back was small, peer review subcommittee of ICC that took a look at self-studies and wrote letters. There was a degree of consensus in ICC when we talked about that last year, that internal review isn't doing a whole lot when each self study maybe gets two readers and then a letter that says "we read it and interacted with it a little bit."

He noted ICC has to find a balance of course between an unrealistic workload on one hand, and on the other hand, having so few readers that the process doesn't really have a whole lot of meaning. He noted his belief that everybody in the committee agreed that in a perfect world, we would all be reading them because we are reading all of them because of the wonderful insights we would get from a deep dive into various programs around campus and learning about how other how our colleagues are doing stuff around campus. He noted the process was disrupted by the Pandemic but that he, Ramesh, Steve and Julie read a few of the studies, and Julie took that feedback and wrote up letters we have two studies that came in last spring, late so we didn't get to them here in this body, but they're waiting to be reviewed.

Assoc. Dir. Wicklund shared the attached PowerPoint and proposed since the ICC has only two studies that we need to read this fall, every single faculty member on ICC reads both of them since there's only two. He noted the reason he says faculty members is that this is supposed to be a peer review process and that sort of excludes administrators but furthered that everything he proposes is up for discussion. He continued, stating everybody should read those two self

studies and give their impressions section by section in a Google survey doc that he put together. The doc puts each section of the self study in a template for review and allows one to just give impressions section by section. Then the peer review subcommittee—which needs to be selected—will take all of those comments and organize them and present them to this body. He summarized the pilot process as such: after the full ICC discussion, the subcommittee will draft the letters in the that shareable will sign them all faculty on ICC are reading the self studies and giving their impressions, and then that small subcommittee is doing the writing of the letters, but that way the self studies won't just being pushed off to this tiny subcommittee and very possibly only getting two people reading each self study. He noted a dozen self studies are coming due at the end of February, which makes for an exciting march here in ICC, but thinks, based on our experience this fall and doing this sort of quasi pilot, we can decide how should we do it this spring.

Vice Provost Oling-Sisay noted the committee made a lot of progress from where they've been, since before there was a spot missing in the process in that oftentimes the, the deans didn't see the self study; she noted they have attempted to address that, to make sure that the deans are in on the ground floor at the MOU level because when the self studies, get out to external reviewers, it's really, really important that they represent our best work and part of that is providing a series of levels of review in, and I believe we are trying to reset the deans in the process so that we can have that part addressed as well.

Assc. Dir. Wicklund noted he might have misspoke because he understood the committee had settled on it being that the ICC portion of the review would be exclusively a peer review only faculty and then the deans would be involved at the other end and the discussion of the MOU.

Vice Provost Oling-Sisay explained the committee never did get to making that decision, which is why she is underscoring it, because the deans need to be in on the process and not be surprised about things that are coming back from the external review, having not seen; the ICC needs to determine where the Deans fit in. She noted she sees two places the Deans could fit in either at that point before it comes to the ICC, or they are at the point where the review from the ICC and the outcome letter goes to the Dean with the feedback before it goes to the external review.

Assc. Dir Wicklund suggested keeping the internal review as a peer review, and then that letter will go to the chair and the dean, and then the deans step in before the program sends it off to their external reviewer.

Chair Tremain introduced Dr. Marisol Ruiz-Gonzalez to service on the GEAR committee.

Dean Zechman pointed out that wherever the deans are inserted, the review should be blind so one review doesn't influence the other. Assc. Dir. Wicklund noted his survey doc is set up that way.

Chair Tremain noted she has some concerns but stated she thinks having a true faculty peer review is a very rich and it speaks well to the fact that self studies haven't been given any feedback and now all of a sudden, it's actually a body of faculty looking at your peer review and giving you feedback. She worried if the faculty goes through all the review, it lands on the Dean's desk and the Dean has not seen the self-study and now is all of a sudden presented with the faculty review. She suggested the ICC could have a template similar to the one already in the self study that'd be just for Dean's and we keep that separate.

Vice Provost Oling-Sisay explained she would be okay with whatever is decided, as long as we somehow bring the deans into the process so that it's not always a surprise.

Assc. Dir. Wicklund cautioned that if the ICC starts discussing the order of review again, then the record must state that this will be the third time the body has discussed it, and it will be the third time that the body has reached a conclusion on it. He suggested the ICC leave the order as is suggested, because it's been heavily discussed.

Chair Tremain reminded everyone the order is what is listed in the pilot presentation: since we already have Deans that sit on ICC, there should be a parallel template for the Deans' use, and when the peer review committee sits down to start to look through the feedback and write the letter, they will also have feedback from the Dean's template. So that when the letter goes out from the ICC chair back to the chair of the program that did the self study that Dean is cc'd there and they can know their feedback was included in the letter.

Assc. Dir. Wicklund stated his feeling has been that the program should be taking some time to do in earnest self study, then the ICC reviews it, then an external reviewer reviews the program, and then the program takes all of this feedback and does any revisions to the self-study, and in particular the action plan. After that whole process, then it goes to the Dean. He noted this is because the process in this way would be a chance for the program to get every opportunity along the way to present a badass study and action plan to the Dean in the end. He concluded he hasn't felt like the Dean needs to be in the process along the way but noted he certainly defers to the committee.

Vice Provost Oling-Sisay noted to be fair to the Deans, that they should have the opportunity to weigh in at some point, because they are the responsible entity. She explained she is all for peer review, but just want to make sure that the Deans have an opportunity if they so wish to weigh in at some point, since there have been challenging instances where the deans of kind of expressed, "Oh my gosh, I had no idea that that you all had these challenges with the self-study."

Dean Zechman stated he believes a lot of programs would probably prefer that the external reviewer weigh in prior to going to the Dean, since in many cases, the external reviewer serves

to confirm some of the challenges that the program might encounter and, perhaps the dean or somebody else may not appreciate those challenges until it's confirmed by an external reviewer. He noted he would not mind receiving the review after it had gone through some iteration with external folks and even internal folks so the Dean can react to a culmination of these different inputs.

Professor Madar explained it seems to her really important that the Dean come in at the end, and noted that programs want the Dean to see the result of what an external person says so they can use that to make a case about what they want to do with their program. She explained in order to close the loop, and in terms of how things are implemented, it's important for the Dean to be at the end of the process. She requested clarification about whether they are talking about putting in an additional preliminary Dean's review somewhere in the middle, or if they are talking about the Deans review only being in the middle. She suggested there's a moment for a preliminary kind of look, but registered her belief that it's important to close the loop at the end.

Vice Provost Oling-Sisay explained she is fully supportive of the peer process but she feels it's awkward for the Dean to receive from the ICC something that perhaps they're not expecting and then the Dean starts asking questions. She explained she just wanted the ICC to have a conversation because she thinks that was a problem and was awkward she reassured the committee that she will go with whatever this group decides.

Assc Dir. Wicklund noted he personally thinks the system that we're building is keeping the Dean aware of, of the process along the way and so it'll be okay.

Chair Tremain suggested taking the slides that Assc. Dir Wicklund shared today and make sure some clear language is added about when the dean is notified, and suggested maybe it makes more sense that when the self study comes in, the ICC chairs job is to let the Dean know where it is in the ICC process and that it's going through faculty peer review, and if the ICC wants to share the self study with the dean at that time, then that's fine too.

Professor Moyer asked about the timing for reading the programs this semester, and voiced concern about the amount of time required of the CDC folks. She reminded the committee it takes hours of work outside of the committee to go through proposals with a fine tooth comb and get them sorted through and the CDC has a lot of that already, not to mention the potentially forthcoming ethnic studies and those curriculum deadlines.

Professor Kerhoulas asked, having never done a program review, she is curious about what it involves. She liked Mark's compromise that the CDC faculty could optionally elect to review.

Chair Tremain noted the history on this campus is that of self studies being submitted and then just going into some kind of void, and Mark has worked really, really hard since he's moved into

the assessment position to change that and make assessment really meaningful, and it's something that we've needed for a really long time. She noted what he's putting forward today is this process for which we're sort of we're looking at a self study together and giving feedback on it. And these two this fall that came in late, give us an opportunity to get exposure to what it means.

Chair Tremain noted Professor Howe asked how long they are; Ass. Dir. Wicklund noted the wildlife one was about 20-30 pages and the template asks seven questions.

Chair Tremain summarized that for now, what the ICC is going to do, is move forward on the plan that if you are a faculty member and you're on ICC please plan to read two self studies. One is from wildlife and one is from Leadership Studies, and if you are on CDC, you are allowed to take a pass. She noted in the in the spring, there will be a minimum of 12 self studies coming in that, then will be distributed across faculty in this body, and they will be as Dean Zechman suggested, blind reviewed both this round on next round where you will fill out a template.

She noted the ICC also needs to figure out is the peer review committee that then will go through the template and draft the letter that will then go back to the chair, saying that it's been reviewed by a faculty body. The body will be comprised of one faculty member from each college, the library, and Assc Dir Wicklund.

Assc. Dir. Wicklund suggested the blind peer reviews would be all faculty, but AMP could be the subcommittee that then takes those blind peer reviews and organizes them and then brings them to ICC for discussion.

Discussion: General Education Course Proposals

Debrief: B4 Mathematics presentation & EO 1110
CSU Math Council B4 Guidelines/ ICC stance on B4
Revised GEAR PLOs
GE proposal chill (information)

Chair Tremain explained there is a special meeting called next week to talk about the ethnic studies response to the chancellor's office and noted she plans to reach out to a few members who have been on the front lines of that work in the meantime, in order to maybe start to draft of the coordinated response that then the membership would maybe talk through a bit more next week for half of the meeting.

B4 Discussion (Agenda Item 7)

- Does the broader institution understand the ways that B4 (and A2) courses are accountable to the mandate of EO1110? How might ICC need to visibly account for the ways that the Math Dept. has worked to respond to the EO and is still in process here?

- Do the recent efforts of the B4 math program combined with the administrative/scheduling advantages of the current system bring us to a confident decision that our students are best served with Area B4 courses being the exclusive domain of the math program?
- Risks/benefits of B4 outside of math?
- If we agree that B4 should continue to be housed in math, what draft language and/or processes are necessary to communicate B4 principles to HSU faculty? If not, what should programs demonstrate in order to warrant their own B4 courses?

Chair Tremain noted the last agenda item is really crucial and time sensitive because of things that are sitting in the in the queue and curriculum and clarified that November 2 is not when the actual executive orders to be modified and sent out. Rather, November 2 is when the feedback is due on the draft executive order; there are hints that the revised executive order would emerge sometime in late November.

Chair Tremain reported the last ICC full meeting included a presentation from Bori and Sonia from Department of Mathematics on B-4, and their response to the executive order 1110. Areas B-4 and A-2 sit under this mandate which has various components. She noted the main gist of the mandate is to align with GI2025 and eliminate remediation in B-4 and A-2 programs across the CSU. The presentation illuminated how B-4 which on this campus does a lot of work across this campus to provide GE Quantitative Reasoning Curriculum has responded to this executive order. B-4 courses across the CSU have been courses where students struggle with high DFW rates. She further explained the ICC has seen two proposals for B-4 courses that are not in mathematics. One is in Sociology and the other one has been sitting in the queue from Psychology, while at the same time, we also have revised gear program learning outcomes and more transparent and an ideally meaningful assessment model coming for GEAR over the course of this year.

She concluded that the question for ICC is how does the committee respond to GE proposals for B-4 courses outside of math at this point.

CDC Chair Kerhoulas noted from the CDC's point of view, these two proposals have kind of been in the queue for a really long time during the GE chill, and the committee is not really sure how to respond as the department loses patience.

Chair Tremain reminded the committee there are there are significant implications if we move B-4 courses outside of math.

Assc. Dir Wicklund asked what is the justification for B-4 classes only being in math as far as administrating and course registration and classroom organization.

Assoc. Registrar Robinson noted she doesn't see the issue with having B-4 courses in a department outside of math because really, as long as students are achieving the general education learning outcomes, then it is fine. She noted that currently, students are taking Psych 241 and not getting GE credit so they have to take an additional course, even though, at most, community colleges and equivalent course does meet Gen Ed, and so it doesn't seem like one particular department should have the complete autonomy over a general education area.

Vice Provost Oling-Sisay reminded the group if they decide to go outside of the math department, they need to make sure that the executive order is being supported because that is so, so important because the, the executive order police are going to be going to Math for the responses. She cautioned if ICC wants to declare that this is going to be everywhere then ICC needs to pay attention to the executive order as well as enrollment and how that gets spread across the different programs. Oftentimes there are unintended consequences in these decisions that allows for small classes spread across the board teaching similar things, and this body is supposed to be paying attention to stuff like that. She concluded noting the only hook here is the executive order and if the executive order is attended to, we should be able to make a different decision, and she doesn't feel like she has enough data to make a decision.

Dean Zechman echoed Vice Provost Oling-Sisay's concern about a number of smaller classes across campus that would be delivering similar content in different programs. He also voiced concern with how many programs would spend the time that math has spent analyzing this problem with student comprehension. He noted the argument for keeping within the disciplinary experts might be important.

Chair Tremain thanked the committee and asked that the membership think more on this question, and communicate the information about ethnic studies implementation to their programs, colleges units, etc. She stated she and Assoc. Dir. Wicklund will follow up with program review information.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00am

Next meetings:

- **Tuesday, October 27 (Full ICC 10am - 11am)**
- **Tuesday, October 27 (Sub-committee meetings)**
- **Tuesday, November 3 (Full ICC)**