CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM

Approved Minutes of the Meeting of October 21, 2013

Present: Andrew Carlos, Brian Cook, Jennifer Eagan, Cristian Gaedicke, Barbara Hall, Yi He, Keith Kravitz, Danika LeDuc (Secretary), Jim Mitchell, James Murray (Chair), Susan Opp, Nancy Thompson, Michelle Xiong

Absent: none

Guests: Sarah Aubert, Norman Bowen, Endre Branstad, Kim Geron, Jiansheng Guo, Garrett Moriguchi, Sally Murphy, Angela Schneider

1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P (Murray/He)
   Murray suggested “5ai” should be “5ab” with letters following appropriately incremented.
   Passed unanimously.

2. Approval of the minutes of October 7, 2013
   M/S/P (Murray/Eagan)
   Opp had several suggestions for amending the minutes. Murray’s question about quantification of differences between evaluators’ scores was not clearly answered. The minutes should be corrected such that it is clear that a portfolio does not fail, but does not clear competence. They should also indicate the difference in criteria for passing the course and the WST. Carlos indicated a spelling error in the word “give.” A statement by Guo was misrepresented as a fact rather than a suggestion and should be changed. Opp asked about the Online Task Force. Murray explained that committee has finished its’ work and such issues will go to the Technology and Instruction Subcommittee. This is correct in the minutes. Eagan noted that her name was misspelled on the bottom of page 4.
   Amended minutes passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Chair
   Nothing to report.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   Opp shared an information item regarding Early Start programs for incoming freshmen who score below a certain level on EPT/ELM or SAT. Students in the program take courses the summer before starting as a freshman in the fall. In the past, courses were offered for all levels of remediation in math but only the lowest level in English. English courses will now be expanded to include all levels of remediation, and students will be required to take a minimum of 1.5 quarter units in the summer. Cook asked if curriculum
needs to be developed. Opp replied that she has not yet met with the English composition faculty to discuss this.

5. Old Business:
   a. Online GE courses referral
      Courses approved for GE must be re-certified when moved hybrid or online. Opp is concerned with the lack of oversight in that classes are being moved hybrid/online without gaining approval from GE Subcommittee. Eagan pointed out that after passing the College Curriculum Committee it should trigger a move to GE Subcommittee. Opp says that the APGS form says “must be submitted to GE subcommittee.” Guo commented that no one is watching that this is followed. Opp said that GE approval is for a course, not section by section or quarter by quarter. It is not possible for students and grad evaluators to know if a course is online or not and does or doesn’t count for GE. Schneider said that Perry can run a report every quarter for every course that is online/hybrid and cross-reference that list with a list of approved GE courses sometime between when the schedule is posted and before classes start. APGS could then notify department chairs when a listed course has not been approved and to remove it. Murray clarified that the policy would be that PEM will generate the lists for APGS, who will cross-check to approve and then notify departments. Murphy was concerned about the potential effect on course offerings, particularly for the C1 requirement, which has the fewest eligible courses. With only a two week window, students in cancelled classes may not be able to find another option. Opp said departments can still offer it on ground. LeDuc asked about checking once early when the schedule was first posted and then later closer to classes starting to help with this problem, but Opp does not have the manpower to do multiple checks. Guo asked about changing routing of the forms to require GE approval before the course goes to the college Curriculum committee. Opp replied that the larger issue was getting any approvals for moving a class online, not just the GE approval. Eagan suggested that an information campaign is in order to make sure department chairs know these requirements. Opp suggested that CIC make a policy stating that PEM will create a cross-referenced list of scheduled online/hybrid classes and GE approval and give this information to APGS which will let departments know that courses cannot be offered online as GE until approved.
      Murray motioned, Opp seconded
      Motion passes unanimously. Murray will write up policy and communication for department chairs.

   b. Report in Progress (RP) grades referral (Norman Bowen, Kim Geron 2:30 time certain)
      Bowen explained why he moved to an RP grading pattern for “United Nations and the World Community,” which he has taught since the early 90’s. All the work in the course, offered in Winter quarter, is geared toward the conference (April), and his first time taking a group to the Model UN, 3 students did not
participate. He had no way to deal with this since grades had already been turned in. Since the course is about performance and the conference represents an external validation of work, he moved to an RP grading pattern. Eagan clarified that this grading pattern is indicated on the syllabus. Xiong, a political science student, said that all students know that ahead of time. Murray is concerned that not all students know when they register. Opp remarked that this was what Watnik was unsure about. Mitchell congratulated Bowen on good explanation. Gaedicke asked if the delay in grading prevents students from taking other courses or graduating. Bowen explained that students in the course are not usually graduating seniors and that it is offered only in Winter quarter. He sometimes has to write letters to the military or graduate schools explaining why a grade has not been given. If a student were beginning graduate school the very next quarter, he would make the exception to give them a grade. Murray asked if students are surprised that they can’t get a grade at the end of the quarter. Bowen said it may be a good idea to put this information in the catalog, but it is well known. Eagan commented that students mostly don’t know what a class is before they see the syllabus and that is the purpose of the drop period. Murray expressed concern about the uniqueness of the class. Eagan replied that by staying in the class, a student is agreeing to the terms of the syllabus. He asked if multiple sections are offered and if the course is consistently taught. Bowen replied that there is only one section and it is consistently taught year after year. Gaedicke suggested an alternative of splitting the course into a number of units for work during Winter quarter and units for Model UN in Spring quarter. Hall thought it should go into the catalog because of the expectations. Xiong doubted that putting that information in the catalog would really help students. Mitchell asked what the simplest thing would be for Bowen to do. He replied that doing nothing would be simplest. LeDuc said that even with a policy requiring putting information in the catalog, no one would be supervising it. Thompson moved to end discussion.

c. 09-10 CIC 32: Pilot Revision of UWSR for Grad Program
   i. WSS should have reported results to CIC; Chair Watnik sees no evidence of such report and recommends that CIC continue with establishing a policy to recommend to the Senate Murphy talked to Sarah Neilsen, who was in charge of the Summer pilot. She will prepare a report since the WSS has not yet been populated.

d. Seating of CIC subcommittees
   Murray is trying to populate the various subcommittees. He stated that a call for self-nomination has gone out in CBE, and Mitchell said the same of CEAS. A question arose as to who is the Director of Testing and Assessment. Opp said that they are working on an interim. Branstad said they could have a representative from the office. He will talk to Donna Wiley. For graduate programs, Donna Wiley will be the representative
since she is Senior Director of Graduate Programs. Opp said that graduate coordinators are needed to serve on that committee. Eagan asked if the table of subcommittees could be sent out. Branstad has sent it to Deans. Opp asked if the Basic Skills Requirements Appeals Subcommittee could be removed since they are not meeting. Murphy explained that the purpose of this committee was to deal with student requests to graduate without completing A2, B4, or writing requirements. For the writing requirement, this is often seen with international students with ossified issues in English, returning to their home country, and their transcript would indicate that this requirement was not met. Murphy said that there is now an administrative procedure for review, but she was not sure about math. Students are allowed to appeal if: 1) they fail first tier course 3 times, 2) their portfolio is graded “limited competency” 3 times, 3) the instructor says the student did everything he/she can, or 4) the student received a D or D+ in a Tier 2 course. Murray said that the last appeal he did was for math, and it was rejected. If the committee is removed, faculty wouldn’t have a say. Murphy said that students who struggle with math often have learning disabilities so there are alternative pathways to meet the requirement as required by the ADA. They can take courses such as Introduction to Logic, Nature of Math, and, possibly, Personal Finance. Opp expressed concern about getting all the people necessary to populate this subcommittee. She suggested that GE subcommittee could handle it if the need arises. Eagan agreed that the faculty could have a voice through some complement of existing sub-committees. Murray summed up the possible use of GE, WSS, or an ad hoc committee.

Eagan made a motion to temporarily suspend appointments for the Basic Skills Requirements Appeals Subcommittee pending bylaws change. Any appeals could go to GE Subcommittee. Murray seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Eagan suggested that people currently on this committee be asked to join another committee. Sally Murphy is presidential appointee for Critical Thinking GE Subcommittee and Cultural Groups/Women Requirement Subcommittee. Murphy explained that the title of the subcommittee was written incorrectly since this is a graduation requirement of CSU, but it is not a GE requirement. Branstad noted that it is in the bylaws incorrectly. Murray suggested we modify the bylaws (see below). Eagan suggested that recruiting for the Graduate Programs Subcommittee be done at an upcoming meeting of graduate coordinators. Carlos pointed out that Corey Gin is no longer Director of Online and Hybrid Support Center. Opp said that someone will be hired, but, in the meantime, the committee will need a representative. Carlos volunteered for the Library spot on the Technology and Instruction Subcommittee.

e. Discussion of electing CIC members from college curriculum committees

Eagan spoke against this, warning of double dipping in other committees. It also makes CIC less attractive, and it is hard enough to get people to serve.
Opp said the rationale was that by doing so CIC members might be more knowledgeable. However, CIC members shouldn’t have to know everything about their college. Departments or colleges can send representative to meetings.

f. Review of CIC Policies and Procedures; any suggested changes?
   i. Consideration of lengthening all subcommittee seats to 2-year staggered terms
      Murray explained that this was done to one or two subcommittees last year. GE and WSS are two-year terms. Mitchell thought this made sense for GE, but it might be difficult to staff all of them if they were two-year commitments. Opp suggested that to get things up and running in the Fall, we should ask for membership in the Spring. Eagan said the process could be started at the Planning Meeting. Opp noted that there is nothing precluding this in the bylaws.
      The following suggested changes to the CIC Policies and Procedures were made:
      Opp moved to strike the Basic Skills Requirements Appeals Subcommittee. Eagan said that a policy document must also be drafted as to how these appeals will be handled.
      Opp noted that Article IV, Section 8 incorrectly states that a request for approval of a new course does not go to CIC but only APGS. She suggested striking “or Course” from point 1.
      Based on Murphy’s prior comment, it was suggested that we strike “G.E.” from the title of the Cultural Groups/Women Requirement Subcommittee.
      Opp noted that a sentence in Article IV, section 7 #2 is confusing, “this procedure may be modified to allow consideration of a proposal at an earlier date by a 2/3 vote of Committee members present,” and suggested striking. In point #3, she suggested striking the word “only” since representatives should always come.
      With respect to the sentence, “Department and college representatives will be invited to CIC meeting when they have a proposal pending” Branstad emails everyone the agenda. Mitchell said that he appreciates this, but most colleagues don’t read. Eagan suggested that the committee more closely review the documents before the next meeting. Murray asked Branstad to prepare a draft with the above changes, and committee members can make more suggestions at the next meeting if they wish.

   g. 12-13 CIC 20: Policy renewal of General Education classifications
      Last year’s CIC approved a policy whereby all classes in a particular GE category would be renewed or revoked on a 5 year schedule. The current CIC needs to vote to send it to the Senate.
      Motion: Murray Second: Opp. Murphy stressed the importance of the review since faculty change often enough and to ensure the
syllabus looks similar enough to the one that was originally approved. Murray expressed concern about the workload on the GE subcommittee. He wondered if a new committee was needed or if they should increase membership. Opp said that departments will need to turn in syllabi that indicate assignments and that contain GE learning outcomes. She suggested that CIC put out a policy that all GE courses need to have syllabi collected for this review process. This process will begin in 2015. By that time, a new form could be developed, and departments with many GE courses could be prepared. Opp said that WASC will very likely randomly come through and ask for syllabi. She was also concerned with mixing policy and procedure. The policy should not indicate what form departments will fill out. Murphy agreed that the committee would likely prefer a different form. Opp thought departments would as well. The language was changed to: “Will be provided a form for renewal and should be expected to provide syllabi and evidence of student accomplishments.” Passed unanimously.

6. New Business:
   a. 13-14 CAPR 1: Department of Art and Multimedia Graduate Program merger
      Branstad had invited Philip Hofstetter and Gwyan Rhabyt to attend the meeting, but it was on short notice. Opp wondered if this was informational to CIC. She was not sure the policy required any action on CIC’s part.
   b. Credit for Military Service referral
      Schneider explained that students are automatically granted credit with a military transcript or discharge paperwork. They currently receive 9 units of credit for more than 1 year of service: 4 units of E/F credit for Basic Training and 5 units of elective credit. Some military transcripts can also have courses that equate for academic credit. Murphy explained that questions arose about what to do if a student has less than one year of service but has completed Basic Training or if officer school/specialized training should earn additional credit. She was unable to find a CSUEB policy or Chancellor’s Office policy. Murray will meet with Schneider and Murphy to draft policy for next meeting.
   c. Listing DCIE courses with Department courses
      Having the same course titles and numbers stateside and through DCIE listed together is causing some confusion for students in enrolling. LeDuc mentioned the “SS” on PHAP courses. Eagan replied that students do not pay attention to these little designations and that ExCom recommended two different portals. Murray asked what precludes students from enrolling in the other sections. Eagan explained that it is a CSU policy against co-mingling of students. Cook mentioned that this is an issue of scope creep. Extension is
offering certificates, non-credit programs, special session degree programs, and feeder programs taught by regular University faculty. He feels we should leverage infrastructure of Peoplesoft. Opp said that it could be possible to have individual designators at the scheduling level to alleviate confusion. Discussion was concluded because of time.

7. From the Floor
8. Adjournment
   Murray 3:59.