

Tuesday, November 3, 2020, 9:00am, Zoom

Chair Lisa Tremain called the meeting to order at 9:05am on Tuesday, November 3, 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 noted the committee will continue to use the “DR,” “STACK,” and “Q,” chat function, and explained she hopes to end this meeting early, so that faculty can review the two self-studies for the semester, as asked by Assc. Dir. Wicklund. She explained she will review a proposal for changing some procedures on ICC, which she has aimed to ground the proposal in the ICC Bylaws. She noted her understanding that last semester there were conversations about elevating the GEAR subcommittee as a committee of the ICC, and inviting all members to sit on the full ICC, and doing so was basically a done deal.

Subcommittee Reports:

GEAR – Subcommittee Chair Anderson reported the process for the SLO is still going strong.

CDC – Subcommittee Chair Kerhoulas reported the CDC is reviewing numerous proposals that are in our queue trying to take things off of hold that have been on hold for a long time. So just sort of systematically I'm doing what the CDC, that is reviewing things will have a number or something's coming through for consent calendar soon today. She noted the CDC has been working with Assc. Dir. Wicklund and GEAR Chair Anderson to try to figure out the nuances of GE proposals in the queue.

APC – Chair Schnurer reported that APC is doing some nuanced, detailed work on disruptive student policy and online learning environments, and in addition, are going to be part of the negotiated consultation between CFA and HSU in terms of the disruptive student policy.

AMP – Chair Tremain reported that AMP continues to work on the Academic Master Roadmap, and reminded the ICC that the committee is a working group of the strategic plan process. She reported that as chair of AMP, she will present on the Academic Roadmap work and where HSU stands in terms of the strategic plan, at the next full ICC meeting on November 17.

Chair Tremain gave a shout-out to student representative Zane Eddy and thanked him for his help to analyze the data collected in all the various feedback forms and forums. She reported that although 265 responses on the forum is not representative of a huge majority, the constituencies that were represented in those responses were balanced across students, staff, faculty, alumni, community members, and that they did find saturation across those subgroups, in terms of what they reported thinking about HSU; she noted those trends also matched up with the webinars from the spring.

Chair Tremain stated the CDC membership will be stepping out of the full ICC meetings for the foreseeable future through the end of the semester because their queue in Curriculog is large and they need more time to move through that. She gave special appreciation to all the work that that committee is doing and prepared the GEAR and AMP committees to step up to do more curricular review in the coming weeks.

Chair Tremain thanked members of the small writing group that wrote the ICC feedback form to the Chancellor's Office around the ethnic studies legislation and implementation plan by the CO, and noted the feedback is very much in line with the CSU Ethnic Studies Council and multiple Sense of the Senate Resolutions across the CSU. She invited Dr. Begay or Dr. Risling-Baldy to provide more of an update.

Dr. Begay reported she will attend some working meetings this Friday and reported the Board of Trustees meeting will take place on the 17th. Vice Provost Oling-Sisay reported she heard the CO was very impressed with the thoughtfulness of the feedback.

Chair Tremain offered a reminder that the two self-studies for the Wildlife program and the Leadership Studies program are available in the google shared drive, and reported she will be extending the deadline to Monday, November 9, as no one has yet made comments on the internal review form. She explained the peer review ad hoc committee will have a very short turnaround time with which to start to look for trends across the feedback.

Chair Tremain gave the attached presentation and invited the committee to talk about a proposal for improved procedures and improved transparency of the ICC, but first she spoke

about the importance of reading and commenting on the self-studies. She commiserated that she understands everyone is stretched and the workload is intense, but noted the revision of faculty peer review of the self studies is extremely purposeful. She explained the benefits to many faculty taking part in the peer review self studies and reminded the membership that this is the prerogative of the ICC; to engage in peer reviewing and giving faculty-based feedback. She explained the other benefit is that when faculty look at the self studies they learn more about the other programs on our college campus, they see opportunities for connections, they see opportunities for better advisement to students. She asked the faculty to make this a priority and reminded everyone that there will be 13 more self-studies to review in spring 2021.

Chair Tremain stated the members of the CDC do not have to participate in the self studies this round, but they will need to participate in the spring. She stated the AMP and GEAR will need to take on a little bit more work regarding curricular review since the CDC is buried, and according to the Bylaws, the committee work needs to be a little bit more distributed. She noted the ICC is the only campus body afforded with the authority to forward academic planning and curriculum proposals, which makes this a powerful committee that needs to have a better sense of the work.

She pointed out there will be times potentially that the ICC needs to have a have a vote, and noted she has been walking away from these meetings feeling like the committee is spinning its wheels and she couldn't get a sense of where the committee landed. She explained she feels the ICC needs to have a better sense of processes and procedures and to this end, proposes the agendas will be now built around four areas more visibly, the consent calendars and an assignment action calendar. She explained that moving forward, any course proposal not on the consent calendar will be brought to the ICC as a regular agenda item. She also explained that the ICC Chair or Subcommittee Chair will schedule with proposal representatives, a time certain to provide an oral presentation related to the proposal.

Dr. Moyer asked if Chair Tremain is envisioning that all the stuff that will get assigned to the CDC will go to the full ICC first for everybody's approval, or whether she is envisioning that the CDC will list on the agenda everything they are working on. Chair Tremain affirmed the agendas will list which committee is working on what proposals, and noted that she and Curriculum Coordinator Gray will communicate with proposers regardless of whether they're invited for a time certain, to confirm that the proposal is moving forward. Finally, she explained action items as assigned to subcommittees will move through those committees and then they may be assigned to individual faculty members to review in the subcommittee. She noted that subcommittees have the prerogative to carefully read materials, even though one faculty

member may be shepherding through one proposal, or an inquiry related to it. Once things have moved through subcommittees, they'd then come back to full ICC for a voting action, which may just be a general consensus.

Subcommittee Chair Schnurer spoke in favor of the proposal, specifically the idea to list what each subcommittee's working on. Chair Tremain asked for any objections to the proposal for ICC work moving forward; there were none.

Voting action: Cannabis studies proposal

Vice Provost Oling-Sisay reported this proposal was interrupted by COVID-19, and noted an AMP document is sent to the chancellor's office that signals which programs a campus intends to offer in the next 10 years, and that document is due very soon, between December and January. She reported this program idea began because of the location of HSU, the community in which the HSU campus resides, and the kinds of interests and industry connections that HSU has with the surrounding communities and perhaps opportunities for further programmatic enhancements for the campus. She reported this also entailed conversation with the legal counsel at the CO, since even though California State law has relaxed a bit in regards to cannabis, there is still a contradiction with federal law. She noted the current proposal is really looking at policy implications, social justice environmental implications, and the business implications for cannabis; in addition, San Bernardino has already introduced a certificate in cannabis studies.

Vice Provost Oling-Sisay explained the first stage in the proposal is to have a letter of intent, which the ICC is supposed to review through the lens of the following questions: "does the degree support the university mission, vision, core values, and HSU student learning outcomes?" "Is the degree grounded in a recognized scholarly discipline?" "Does the degree serve as a recognized student or societal need?" Before she can tell the college to go ahead and put together a proposal, the ICC needs to say "yea or nay". She explained the ICC's yes or no will kick off a timeline to the CO, and eventually will require a letter from ICC as well as a packet for the CO for a new degree program.

Dr. Moyer asked what department this would be housed in, and requested a broad picture of what the coursework might look like. Vice Provost Oling-Sisay answered that no coursework has been proposed, since it is contingent upon the ICC affirming or not, that they want to entertain a degree in cannabis studies.

Dean Young stated she does not have an opinion about what college this might be housed in, but suggested that there hasn't been a broad conversation about which college is best positioned in.

Vice Provost Oling-Sisay replied that this voting action is just to get the program in the queue so that the CO knows it is the intention of HSU to pursue this program, and explained that the intent is separate from which department and which college this program should belong to eventually.

Dean Zechman noted that Dr. Derrick might be able to speak to the interdisciplinary possibilities for this program based on his GSB proposal, to which Dr. Derrick affirmed and stated he had a hand in drafting this proposal.

Dr. Schnurer stated the three questions that the Vice Provost asked the ICC to consider might be the framing place for this, and noted his appreciation for the interdisciplinary request from Dean Young and Dean Zechman, and noted when versions of this proposal made it to CAHSS, many questions were asked of the proposers regarding environmental racism, feminism issues, and other questions that the college wanted to make sure this curriculum engaged. He stated the second stages in the document provided by the Vice Provost allow the space for some of those discussions to move forward, and that the program has got to be sincerely interdisciplinary; he noted the university should probably get ahead of this and at least mark HSU as the place that does this kind of intellectual work that is exceptionally high quality and interdisciplinary and it should include all three colleges' best practices.

Chair Tremain suggested if ICC approves the program to move forward, that the response letter from the ICC is either written by an ad hoc group across the full ICC, or the AMP subcommittee, which would take on the work of shepherding the new program through.

Professor Moyer spoke in favor of approving the program proposal today, even though she has many questions, and reminded the ICC that their approval is giving permission to try to create a program, rather than the ICC approves the creation of it as it stands. She explained some of her questions about what department this program will come from stems from the trauma that she still suffers from, having dealt with the Leadership Studies proposal that was pushed through without a program to have a home for it. She suggested it would be beneficial to the proposal to include some very, very broad statement about what the curriculum for this degree is going to look like, whether it be a Social Science degree, or a business degree, or a science degree, or

whether it will be a mixture of all sorts of different things combined in any sort of focus or slant or equal combination.

Chair Tremain thanked the ICC for its thoughtful discussion and stated this will be a good case study for the UCC to think about what an interdisciplinary program really look like at HSU.

Dean Young restated her appreciation for the comments and stated she agrees with approving a letter of intent for the program as long as more conversation is had about the appropriate placement of this program.

Professor Bloedon noted it could also be easier to start creating an interdisciplinary graduate studies program, since sometimes such a program can be tested out and have different specific tracks or areas of emphasis within it as a graduate studies program first, if it is not meant to be focused solely on undergraduates.

ICC vote to approve the initial letter of intent for this program passed via general consent

Consent Calendar:

Chair Tremain noted there are three items on the consent calendar for approval.

Professor Moyer requested clarification based on the new process at the beginning of the meeting, on the term for this calendar—she noted she would have thought this would have been action calendar and not consent calendar.

Chair Tremain answered the ICC will discuss what's on this consent calendar, and will vote on the items today; Professor Moyer noted if there is enough time, it can be really beneficial to have the CDC shepherd give a brief introduction to the proposal for the ICC, and then let any questions come up; this is the opportunity for those additional sets of eyes to offer something that the committee didn't think of.

Chair Tremain agreed and asked for an introduction from the CDC shepherd for the Geology courses. Professor Moyer introduced the proposals, explaining the program is revising their minor as they've lost some faculty and some of the classes they've been teaching won't be there anymore. She explained some classes are bottlenecks in that lots of students from lots of different majors have to take them and the Geology students have had a hard time getting into some of those classes, so they've done a lot of good thinking about alternative courses they could ask students to take that would enable to learn that material and make it easier for them

to get through the minor. Professor Moyer concluded, noting the only issue in there is a week-long Spring Break field trip; she reported they wanted to find an alternative, and recommended it'd be a 700 level credential course, and the CDC membership said no, so as much as the Geology folks wanted an alternative and as much as the CDC supported the idea of an alternative, they can't find one that will work, so the field trip is still required.

Subcommittee Chair Kerhoulas introduced the proposal from Philosophy, to change the core requirements, explaining they want to add a new course--Philosophy 349: Latin American Philosophy—as a three unit elective for the Philosophy BA. This is in an attempt to modernize the curriculum and expand the representation of non-Eurocentric philosophy. She noted the second corresponding proposal is to change the core requirements to have this new course be one of the electives for the philosophy major.

ICC voted to approve the items on the Consent Calendar via general consent.

Assc. Dir. Wicklund proposed that the terms voting calendar and consent calendar imply more plainly whether the items are up for a long discussion or if they are true consent calendar items that are so straightforward they require no discussion. Professor Moyer pointed out typically, it's been possible to take the true Consent Calendar items and approve them all as a bunch, because they are pretty straightforward.

Information Calendar: Program curriculum change discussion: English ([packet link](#))

Chair Tremain introduced the program curricular change proposal from the English department and asked that Subcommittee Chair Kerhoulas introduce the packet.

Subcommittee Chair Kerhoulas explained this packet has been in the works for a long time and it would be bringing English into alignment with EO 1071 with 58 proposals in the packet. She explained most recently the CDC was working on the last few kinks and provided an explanation in the summary outline about the numbering issue, as well as courses that would be co-listed as graduate and undergraduate courses.

Curriculum Coordinator Gray stated the CDC has worked with the English department to finally align their co-listings with the policy so that this will hopefully never come up again for discussion. She noted they have arrived at of course numbers that are in alignment with the policy and are not used for any other previous courses.

ICC vote to approve the packet of proposals from the English department passed via general consent.

Action item: B4 update/feedback to programs outside of Math

Chair Tremain stated she will call for a vote on the ICC response to the proposal for B-4 courses in Psychology and Sociology in the queue. She thanked multiple people in the group who helped write up the points that ICC has discussed so that the ICC can actually give a response to these proposals and their programs. She noted part of the reason that she brought new procedures forward to ICC stemmed from fact that the membership was at an impasse about whether B-4 should stay in Math only, or whether any proposal should be shepherded through as long as it meets the GE requirements. She noted that after discussions on B-4, committee members were going out and talking to their allies around B-4, which caused a lot of faculty to get upset, and created a lot of tension. She stated ICC needs to have better clarity and communication about how they are making decisions. She reported that as she looked over the Minutes and thought about B-4 proposals that are not housed in Math and everything the committee heard, ultimately B-4 programs need to be accountable to the executive order 1110.

She noted last week she, Subcommittee Chair Anderson, Professor Bori Mazzag, and Assc. Dir. Wicklund had to go to a meeting at the chancellor's office to give a full report on HSU's programs, specifically, what HSU has done to meet the executive order, in addition to plans for the next year of implementation. She explained they also looked at all the other programs that are implementing B-4 and A-2 responses to 1110 across the CSU and gave feedback to their programs, so there is deep accountability to the Executive Order, because that EO eliminated remediation. This means HSU has to set up programs that support students who would have needed remediation before. She explained that in fairness and for parity, the ICC would ask any B-4 program proposal to also be in alignment with EO 1110. Chair Tremain further explained there is a response letter outlined for the proposals that states the ICC can consider approval of the programs, as long as the proposals meet the components of EO 1110. She noted they also need to account for the curricular needs of non-social or non-psych majors, as a GE course. In addition, other factors considered are things like course bloat in a time of declining first year enrollment. Chair Tremain concluded and proposed that representatives from Psych and Sociology should provide a response about how they would meet the EO and afterwards, they be invited to come discuss with the ICC.

Dean Zechman voiced concern that if these programs are approved that the programs should agree they could all count for the same requirement, such that a Psychology major could transfer their major to Wildlife, the courses could articulate without needing another stats

class. In addition, he stated he would like a full account of the budgetary implications of dividing these up into multiple programs multiple faculty and smaller classes.

Chair Tremain asked if there any objections to giving feedback to these programs regarding that the ICC would consider approval if they first show how they've met the components of the EO 1110 mandate and are accountable to the revised gear program learning outcomes.

Chair Tremain asked about whether the ICC makes any decisions or gives any feedback that has to do with budget, or if those questions are considered if and when proposals go to the Deans level and the Provost level. She noted that the letter does take some budgetary concerns into account, since the declining first year enrollment and course bloat consider budget impacts.

Professor Moyer stated she doesn't think that budget is a bad thing to consider as part of the package.

Subcommittee Chair Kerhoulas noted particularly for the Psychology proposal, that an answer has been a long time coming, and noted she can't really tell what the ICC's stance is on the big picture concept of allowing these GE math classes outside outside of the math department.

Chair Tremain agreed that she has heard both that any course that meets GE outcomes should be considered for B-4 classes, but ultimately that these proposals as they are currently written do not meet the executive order's criteria, and they must do so in order for them to continue to be considered. She stated she feels it may be an upper administrative level decision to be considered with budgetary knowledge as to whether B-4 classes are only allowed in Math.

Subcommittee Chair Kerhoulas voiced concern about stringing folks along by having them jump through all these hoops and do all this footwork to show how they're going to meet all of these requirements, when the reality may be that these aren't really allowable.

Chair Tremain suggested the letter may need to be specific and transparent, that there are budget implications that ICC does not factor into the decision making and that might stop a proposal.

Assistant Registrar Robinson spoke to the budget issue from a different lens, noting there are budgetary impacts for students as the ICC may be pushing the burden onto students to take additional coursework, rather than approving courses that are already potentially meeting the

learning outcomes. She suggested another option could be that stat courses are not offered in lower division classes in specific disciplines.

Dean Zechman mentioned maybe this is a situation where budgetary implications are at least equal to curricular implications in terms of their weight, and maybe the ICC you know, maybe we as a body could then kick it up to the Vice Provost to advise.

Professor Moyer spoke in favor of requesting the Vice Provost make a ruling.

Dean Young stated she believes in order for the Vice Provost to make such a determination, there would be consultation with the Provost and the three Deans, and so the ICC would then be literally handing off this curricular decision to the Provost, the Vice Provost and the three Deans. She stated the curricular authority resides with the faculty and the discretion is from curricular standpoint, does a course meet the requirements to be position now where the deans within a college come in with that is, how many sections of things are offered and there's, you know, the budget plays its role when core schedules are developed. Um, I don't know, these are

Chair Tremain reiterated that the ICC doesn't want to give feedback saying it will continue to entertain proposals if certain boxes are checked without being transparent that there are other things in play that are not under the ICC's purview, in terms of decision making, such as budget.

Registrar Rebik stated he believes the ICC should concern itself with deciding how to make faculty proposals happen within their rules and from a curricular aspect; in this case, the ICC should communicate that a proposal should fulfill the EOs and then if the proposal is approved by everyone else then it is a go.

Chair Schnurer spoke in agreement with Subcommittee Chair Kerhoulas, noting it would be vital that whatever communication the ICC shares with those who proposed be clear that the standards and expectations at the front end be the same ones at the back end. He requested of Chair Tremain to pause on the notion of a letter to these two programs until this committee can make some decision about the direction.

Chair Tremain asked if faculty are going to go out and report to their allies on the different sides of this fraught discussion that they represent this thoughtfulness being shown in the committee and noted that more discussion is required before a letter is written that describes what the ICC can do under its purview.

Assoc. Dir. Wicklund stated on behalf of everyone that it is unforgivable that these two proposals got lost for as long as they did but noted the conversation today shows, above all, why these proposals got lost because this is so complicated.

Chair Tremain noted it's been she and the three new sub committee chairs who have borne the brunt of anger about the fact that these proposals have gotten lost, which is why she is frustrated to see that the ICC still has not come to a decision. She stated that at least a letter may be developed to be as transparent and honest as possible that the programs must meet EO 1110 and GEAR PLOs to be considered.

Subcommittee Chair Kerhoulas stated she believes the vote on the table is whether the ICC agrees that B-4 classes should be able to be offered outside of the math department, as long as they meet the criteria of the executive order and GEAR PLOs and assessment requirements.

Professor Moyer stated if the ICC moves in the direction of approving this, then in addition to the executive order support it would be wise to have these courses participate in the same work that the math department is doing for faculty development and assessment of the courses.

Curriculum Coordinator Gray noted the ICC seems to be trying to answer a bigger question through these two proposals that happen to be on our plate right now, so the vote should be what is the ICC's stance, because that will guide the response to these two proposals.

Chair Tremain noted in these particular cases, there's a broader conversation that is not necessarily under our purview that has to do with the fact that HSU has major budget issues right now, and that should be brought to the proposers attention.

Assoc. Dir. Wicklund suggested the conclusion of the letter is says exactly that, that the ICC's hesitation is that, "we do not want to give you a bait and switch, hold on until the Vice Provost and Provost make a decision," or something along those lines of "the final decision could be out of the ICC's hands."

Chair Tremain asked for advice on whether it is her prerogative, as the chair of ICC, to go and have these discussions at the Provost level, or does the committee want the Provost to come and speak to the full committee.

Professor Moyer stated, given Dean Zechman's point, that the either the Provost or Vice Provost is going to be the final approval of these decisions, it would be very helpful to know in advance if there is going to be a “no” at that upper level stage, since the ICC really doesn't want to make people do all that work for nothing.

Action Item: Bylaws change re: GEAR elevation and duties

Chair Tremain stated she will create a google form so that the ICC may vote on the creation of a resolution to change the ICC Bylaws regarding the elevation of the GEAR subcommittee and its duties.