CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM

Amended Minutes of the Meeting of October 7, 2013

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

Absent: Keith Kravitz, Jim Mitchell

Guests: Sarah Aubert, Eileen Barrett, Endre Branstad, John Eros, Jiansheng Guo, Penny McCullaugh, Sally Murphy, Glen Perry, Angela Schneider

1. Introductions

2. Appointment of Secretary: LeDuc

3. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P (Thompson/Gaedicke)

4. Approval of the minutes of May 20, 2013
   M/S/P (Hall/Carlos)
   Murray noted a spelling error. Recommends changing “8.7 C Potential solutions were discusses.” to “8.7 C Potential solutions were discussed.”
   Murray and Eagan abstained because they missed the meeting. Minutes, with revision, were approved.

5. Report of the Chair
   Online task force is in the final process of revising policy. Any further Online Task Force duties will be subsumed by the existing CIC subcommittee on Technology & Instruction.

6. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   No report at the moment.

7. Old Business:
   a. 12-13 WSS 1: Pilot of new process for Writing Skills Portfolio Evaluation in First Tier Writing Course (ENGL 3000, ENGL 3001)
      The committee reviewed an information item regarding the writing skills requirement with Opp providing background explanation as follows. Students who do not score sufficiently on the Writing Skills Test or choose to do coursework path instead will take ENGL 3000 or 3001. These are first tier writing courses in which the students generate a portfolio of work to be evaluated. Previously, the portfolio evaluated by two outside instructors, not the faculty teaching the course. In an effort to streamline the process, now one evaluator taught the course and the other did not. If the two assessments differ significantly, the portfolio will be evaluated by a third person.
Murphy explained that scores of 1-6 are not passing, a score of 7 requires a second class, and 8 is a clear pass. Murray asked what percentage of students uses this option, but the answer to this is not known. Murphy did clarify that they can take the test twice, but if they get 6 or below both times, they must take the classes. Guo explained that some students get a bit confused about the difference between the course and the portfolio evaluation. Specifically, they pass the course, but when their portfolio is not deemed to have cleared competence. He asks how to explain this to students. This is because criteria for passing the course and clearing the WST are different. Murphy said that this is a big problem in which students are getting a C or better on the first tier course, but their portfolio does not receive a 7 or 8. In this case, they would be required to repeat ENGL3000, but they can’t register for the course a second time without completing a petition (since they have earned a C or better). These are always approved immediately, but the student may have lost the chance to get in the class in the meantime. The change in evaluators is an attempt to see if having the instructor and one outside reader review the portfolio will reduce this problem. Carlos asked what the rationale was for separate portfolio evaluation. Murphy explained that there was too much pressure on the composition faculty to give a passing grade. Eagan replied that this brings up what is meant by a passing grade or standard. Opp explained that a prior policy was that no grades were turned in until after the portfolio was evaluated, but in that case the instructor is not actually doing the reviewing and grading work that would be expected in teaching a class. Also, the choice to go with two evaluators is to make the process as parallel as possible with the Writing Skills Test, which is scored by two evaluators. Gaedicke asked why the pressure on instructors to pass students in this class was any different from any other difficult course. Murray replied that it was necessary for all students to graduate. LeDuc asked whether students could be required to redo their portfolio rather than the class again. Opp explained that this was not possible since 1) the portfolio should show the development of skills over time, 2) there is an in-person writing assignment, and 3) they need to make sure it is the actual student doing the work.

b. 13 -14 CIC 1: Request for modification of Kinesiology Elementary School PE and Secondary School PE courses
An action was requested to prioritize kinesiology students for these courses.
M/S(Murray/He)
Discussion: Opp explained that Peoplesoft may not be able to deal with it. Perry said they could make the course only kinesiology majors or reserve a certain percentage of seats. Opp asked what other students take it. McCullaugh answered Human Development. LeDuc asked about Liberal Studies students on the Teacher Preparation Pathway. McCullaugh explained they take a different class. Opp was curious as to why it is a problem. McCullaguuh explained that it is needed by Kinesiology majors under the Teaching Option. Perry suggested listing being a Kinesiology major as a pre-requisite. The following language was suggested: Prerequisite: kinesiology major or permission of instructor
Thompson asked if that doesn’t create an issue for someone who has yet to declare. McCullaugh replied that they will have to declare to get in the class. Perry stated that based on the will of the Academic Senate Peoplesoft should be able to check prerequisites by May.

Suggested language was approved unanimously.

M/S/P (Murray/Opp)

8. New Business:
   a. Online GE courses
      i. Application for GE Credit: History of Rock and Roll, Music 1006
         This course has been approved for GE as on-ground, but needs review for online format. Eagan stated that such a review will require the committee to see a syllabus and assignments so the outcomes can be compared with the on-ground course and other lower division GE courses. Eros will provide requested documentation. Murray will put it on the agenda for the next meeting. Murphy explained that the course is okay for GE right now, and that is a preemptive action. Perry clarified that the course being offered online now will carry GE credit regardless of what happens later to this application. Murphy and Opp both explained that they have not pulled any GE approvals.

      ii. POSC 3111 Online/Hybrid Course Modification Request (requires GE Subcommittee review)
         Opp gave background on this request that originally the questions were not adequately addressed. The committee was shown what was resubmitted. The real problem and point of bringing it up is that this is an example of a GE course which has not been approved (or even given to the committee) to be offered online and yet is being offered. These things happen all the time. The University does not have the person power to make sure that courses which haven’t been approved aren’t being offered. Eagan agreed that there are no blocks to scheduling a course. Opp explained that currently tracking courses is a manual process, but that they are investigating a software system to use instead. She gave an example of one department which submitted a blanket approval for all their courses to be online, but there is no easy way to keep track of which ones actually are. This leads to student accessibility and faculty development issues. Eagan remarked that if the currency is enrollment, it is too tempting to grab an online lecturer. Guo said the policy is there – going through college committee, CIC, and GE subcommittee, the real problem is in implementation. He suggested that with a brand new course, Sarah Aubert can give permission to unlock the padlock on that course, but the capabilities have not caught up with online/hybrid/GE attribute.

         Opp brought up a second issue. She has no direction from CIC of what constitutes acceptable answers on the request form. Maybe this is something for the Technology and Instruction Subcommittee. There is also the issue that none of these classes are verifying student identity. Carlos replied that we don’t check ID’s at exams in on-ground courses. Many responded that some people do or at least you recognize those who have been coming to class. Guo asked why the process for an online/hybrid course is more rigorous than for a brand new...
Opp explained that new courses to have to give a purpose, justification, resources, and learning outcomes. Murphy commented that for the GE Subcommittee, the biggest issue with online classes is the oral component requirement. Yes, there is the technology to videotape yourself, but there is no reflection, no audience. An asynchronous lecture is closer to a written assignment; there is a difference between oral and written language, and that is why both are required. They have approved Discussion Board and asynchronous recordings, but they are not really the same.

Murray asked if the “problem with the latter is that it might not be possible for Peoplesoft to distinguish between online and on-ground courses for the purpose of GE certification.” Perry said it is technically feasible. Murphy said you can search for it. Opp remarked that the free entry is scheduling. She has seen many instances where courses are meeting too many hours or not enough hours. Eagan suggested CIC provide more specific language or examples as response to form and that an announcement regarding the policies for approval is made at a Senate meeting and emailed to all faculty members. Murray agreed with these suggestions. Murray said this proposal will go to GE subcommittee for review.

b. Report in Progress (RP) grades referral
An issue arose with a course requiring attendance at an event after the quarter ends. Eagan asked if this requirement was not in this syllabus. The course in question is POSC 3550, Model UN, taught by Norm Bowen. Gaedicke asked if it shouldn’t be scheduled appropriately to avoid this. Murphy explained that students need to take class in Winter quarter to prepare for the Model UN event in mid-Spring. Opp suggested inviting Norm Bowen to discuss what he does to inform students.

c. Five week classes add/drop/withdraw referral
Perry provided background on the issue with 2nd session five week classes. The problem is that there is no designated census day/add/drop date for the 2nd session. This makes a problem for students since if they fail the first class of a sequence, they get a W for the second class because it is too late to “drop.” Opp said going to self-support in Summer quarter would alleviate this issue since FTES would not be a problem. Eagan asked if the student has an opportunity to petition the W. Perry replied that the student does.

d. GE designation and code requirement referral
The issue here is with intrasystem concurrent enrollment and how courses at some CSU’s count for both GE credit and code requirement (content required by the legislature.) Murphy explained that campuses that do have courses that count for both require more than the minimal number of units in General Education. CSUEB requires only the minimal 72 units so we have declined to double count. Doing so would require adding more units. Political Science and History departments do not feel it is possible in their courses to meet both the code requirements and GE learning outcomes. If a student transfers from a community college or other CSU with a course that counts for both, CSUEB honors that.
Eagen said that this initiative is problematic in that it comes from the Chancellor’s Office and our Senate and CIC did not vote to accept other CSU classes. Their pilot of an online critical thinking course with a very good instructor was not good for the students, so they are not offering it again. It is not the wish of the department to simply have them take an online course developed at Chico. Opp explained that the problem is relatively small right now since our students can only take classes at quarter campuses. The bigger question is about having code and GE double count. For Engineering majors, they already are because of the high number of units. Eagan said we should listen to faculty teaching the courses if they are telling us repeatedly that the courses don’t match both code and GE. Guo asked if they wanted to make such a course, that we would let them. Murphy explained that there is no difference in how the course is being treated, it is not a prohibition. Thompson offered that there is course in History that can count for GE and the code requirement. Eagan explained that students can use it for either one or the other, not both.

e. Withdrawal form issue; disparity between 08-09 CIC 27 and current catalogue language (specifically, Dean mentioned in policy but not on form)
   Opp explained that this is dealing with withdrawals prior to the 7th week. Schneider reported that the Senate policy from 2008 states that withdrawals after add/drop and before last 20% require permission from instructor, department, and college. Since this is a purely administrative matter, the department stamp has been sufficient. The department has the discretion to handle the process as they wish. Their office processes 4000 forms/year. Perry states that the Dean’s signature is not mandatory.

f. Seating of CIC subcommittees
   Murray asked for help in getting subcommittees filled. Opp asked if any are required to have a CIC member. She made a particular plea for writing skills subcommittee. Eagan noted that the critical thinking subcommittee was not on the list. Gaedicke asked for information about the subcommittees. Murphy explained that the GE subcommittee had a set meeting time, opposite Mondays of CIC. Opp explained that the other subcommittees meet as their members can.

9. From the Floor
10. Adjournment
   Eagan 3:55