**AMENDED**

California State University, East Bay
Committee on Instruction and Curriculum
Minutes of the Meeting of 2015 April 20

Members present: Eileen Barrett, Andrew Carlos, Brian Cook, Jennifer Eagan, Cristian Gaedicke, Sue Opp, Nancy Thompson, Claudia Uhde-Stone (Secretary), Joy Vickers, Jing Wen Yang, Mitchell Watnik (Chair).

Members absent: Jim Mitchell

Guests: Sarah Aubert, Bridget Ford, Mark Robinson, Sophie Rollins, Angela Schneider, Jason Singley, Donna Wiley

1. Approval of the agenda
   MSP Carlos, Barrett

2. Approval of 2015Apr6 minutes
   MSP Barrett, Thompson
   Some corrections

3. Reports

   Report of the Chair

   The request from the Department of Communication to revise two options has recently passed the Academic Senate. However, just a day after the request passed, the Department of Communication received a request from APGS to withdraw the option revisions. Now ExCom will need to handle this.

   GE subcommittee: 57 units graduation requirements, 9 units can be counted double, which brings the total units to 48.

   Graduate subcommittee just met. Document in preparation on how to write graduate program proposals.
   Wiley remarks that this is not a policy document, but meant as a guideline.

   Sub-committee on Cultural Groups and Women recently met.
   Barrett: Working on student learning outcomes for proposal.

   Report of the Presidential Appointee
   Opp:
   WASC visit was successful. WASC representatives appreciated the variety of posters.
   Now syllabi need to be collected. Currently there are two separate syllabus policies (general and GE); there should be a way to bring both policies together.
MSP Eagan, Barrett
To suggest combining the two current syllabus policies (general and GE) into one policy.

Report of University Extension
Cook:
On behalf of Provost, congratulated the 35 faculty members who applied for the Online Hybrid Course Quality Transformation grants. Pleased to see developments in this area and hopes that Faculty continues to leverage Online & Hybrid support team on developing courses and programs.

Report of Semester Conversion
Barrett:
Now that departments are working on their semester conversion budget the directors have divided up the departments/programs among one another and have contacted all departments, answered questions, and are prepared to meet with chairs, attend department meetings, assist in anyway we can.

APGS is arranging for an on-campus demonstration of the curriculog system on May 1st. This will be in UU 102 from 1-2pm and that is part of the Semester Conversion Steering Committee meeting.

A team of us from campus will attend the Knowledge Exchange Workshop sponsored by the CO on April 29th at Cal Poly Pomona. This event brings together key members from the CSU campuses undergoing conversion—Bakersfield, LA, Pomona, East Bay, and San Bernardino.

As the President announced Brad Wells, VP for Finance and co-sponsor of the semester conversion project has accepted a new position at the CO. Debbie Chaw from University Advancement will be the Interim VP and co-sponsor of the project with the Provost. The directors who have been meeting with Brad Wells on Wednesday, will begin meeting with Debbie Chaw in May.

Singley: Crucial: how do you want to handle course approval during semester conversion.

4. Old Business
   a. Development of catalog policy for challenging courses
      Watnik: We need to develop a policy.
      Schneider: Would like to look how other campuses deal with this, because there needs to be a way to report grades, which is complicated if students are not actually enrolled in a course.

      By consensus: we will revisit item in 2 weeks.
b. Curriculum Conversion for Semesters
Singley: passes out handout: what does the procedure manual says for different course types:
- new courses
- course discontinuance
- revision of a degree program
- revision of option or minor
- new option or minor
- revision of certificate, credential, or subject matter preparation programs

Opp: all quarter courses will be gone, no mixing of quarter and semester courses
New courses should not go to CIC and Senate.
Eagan: lots of the work will fall on College level Curriculum Committee.
Opp agrees, paperwork will have to be filled out on college level. Possibly check box indicating if a course is truly “brand new” or just semester-converted. This would help for articulation.
Watnik: how can a department, e.g. Math have input if e.g. Business would want to teach their own calculus class.
Opp: optimistic that procedures will be kept transparent
Wiley: bigger problem will be the revision of degree programs
Watnik: straight conversion may not need to be looked at, but program transformation should. Departments get money if they transform, rather than convert. Thus, most may choose to transform.
Singley: CIC (or sub-committee) might need to look at programs, because it is too much for the Academic Senate to deal with 100 or more programs.
Eagan: If cover letter could clearly indicate what is new, committees could focus on the transformative areas.
Barrett: Where do you see the approval program ending?
Eagan: somewhere between CIC and CAPR, at subgroups, and/or College Curriculum Committees
Watnik: some members of college committees should be members of CIC, bringing the discussions from one level to the other.
Suggestion: only if there is a “body” of objection it would have to go through the Academic Senate.
Opp: if you change an option, the change would have to go through CAPR. As far as the Chancellor’s office is concerned, even a change of title has to go to a degree database; Chancellor needs to be notified.
Singley: new options may occur commonly as part of the semester conversion
Some discussion about the definition of “options” and “concentrations”.
Opp: Concentrations and options are similar; the cancellors office uses the term “concentrations” while locally we call them “options”, which is a confusing term.
Wiley: both terms are currently completely undefined
Eagan: concentrations may offer more flexibility, work well for Philosophy. Don’t need extra approval.
Watnik: what do we want to do?
Barrett: can we use some of the language that Singley handed out?
New courses, language:
Review of new semester-based courses that have no unresolved disputes, and are proposed between Fall 2015 and Spring 2017 will be done by the college curriculum committee, college deans, and APGS. It will continue to be the case that courses applying for GE and/or graduation requirements will continue to need to go through corresponding subcommittee(s) of CIC, and then to CIC. New courses seeking approval for general education and/or graduation requirements must continue to follow the approval review policy. Courses that receive less than a 2/3rds approval in CIC will go to the Academic Senate via the Executive Committee for approval. Courses that receive 2/3rds or more approval in CIC will be considered approved by the faculty and forwarded to the President for approval.

Discussion:
Watnik: if Academic Senate agrees that approval for curriculum can stay with CIC, such approval does not have to go through Senate.

If appropriate sub-committee handles course approvals, then these should go to CIC. We can propose to stop at CIC or send as information item to the Academic Senate. Murphy: this could be limited to those courses with controversial issues (such as split vote, e.g. less than 2/3 of votes).

Course Discontinuance, language:
All quarter-based courses will automatically be discontinued once the campus is on a semester-based calendar.

Revision of a Degree Program, language:
Programs that increase the number of required units by more than 3 semester units will be reviewed by CIC. Programs that were considered similar under SB 1440, but will not be considered under semesters will be reviewed by CIC. Programs that require GE waivers to get 120 units or need a waiver to go over 120 units will be reviewed by CIC.

If there are new options (concentrations), the options will be reviewed by CIC (policy already provides that CAPR must see new options). If only the title of an option changes, it needs to be clear that this is just a title change.

c. GE Course Approvals
MSP Eagan, Barrett
Approved

5. New Business
a. Request for separation of Math and Computer Science Department
MSP Opp, Eagan
In support of requested separation of Math and Computer Science.
b. Request for revision of the University Honors Program

MSP Barrett, Thompson
To accept revisions of the University Honors Program.

Opp expresses appreciation for the work that Dr. Ford put into restructuring the Honors program. It is now easier for students to navigate the program.

6. Adjournment
MSP Eagan, Carlos

Respectfully submitted,
Claudia Uhde-Stone
2015, Apr 20