CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM

Approved Minutes of the Meeting of November 4, 2013

Present: Jennifer Eagan, Cristian Gaedicke, Yi He, Keith Kravitz, Danika LeDuc (Secretary), James Murray (Chair), Susan Opp, Nancy Thompson, Michelle Xiong

Absent: Andrew Carlos, Brian Cook, Jim Mitchell, Thomas Duffy

Guests: Sarah Aubert, Endre Branstad, Jiansheng Guo, Sally Murphy, Sarah Neilsen, Glen Perry, Margaret Rustick, Angela Schneider, Mitch Watnik

1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P (Murray/Kravitz)
   Passed unanimously.

2. Approval of the minutes of October 21, 2013
   M/S/P (Murray/LeDuc)
   Passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Chair
   A populated task force is investigating the possible establishment of a “campus hour” during which no classes are scheduled. They may find that this is not possible or may best be done with the move to semesters.
   Murray is talking with Glen Perry about the problems with 5-week courses in Summer quarter. Perry has been in contact with people at the Chancellor’s Office.
   Murray is arranging a meeting with all interested parties regarding cross-registration between stateside and DCIE.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   Opp has talked to the English composition faculty about Early Start. No new curriculum will need to be developed as all students will take the same developmental course.

5. Old Business:
   a. Online GE courses referral
      i. Draft policy
         M/S/P (Murray/Opp)
         Opp suggested that the subject line mention “online/hybrid.”
         Amended policy passed unanimously.
      ii. Memo to department chairs
          Opp said the policy should have an effective date. Murray edited it to say “effective immediately.” The implication is that it is as soon as Senate passes. Eagan mentioned the policy says “APGS will notify department chairs.” Murray and Opp will work together on
memo after passage by Senate. Murphy will notify APGS when GE subcommittee has approved a course. Opp expressed the need for a system that will allow us to track curriculum modifications, proposals, etc… and would like Senate endorsement. This would allow the process to be transparent, accessible, and documented rather than having these approvals go through both CIC and Senate to be documented as suggested by Eagan. The latter would not provide for the quick turnaround needed for courses caught by Perry’s screen. Murray asked if GE courses approved for online could be posted on the GE subcommittee site and said that he would agitate for curriculum tracking software.

b. 09-10 CIC 32: Pilot Revision of UWSR for Grad Program
   i. Rustick explained that the initial plan was for graduate students to meet the UWSR in their major/discipline rather than by taking the WST or a portfolio course with the idea that graduate programs were small enough to handle this. Donna Wiley broached this idea with graduate coordinators and initially met with small interest. Faculty members were concerned that the grade of the course did not translate to WST. The next idea was to separate out a writing component of the course and use it to evaluate writing proficiency. The instructor would then determine if it meets standards. Peter Marsh (Music) piloted this with a course receiving conditional approval. Summer data has not been received as of this time. Rustick presented the committee with a report from Toni Fogarty, Public Administration. The report raise the concern that the Writing Skills Committee would need to examine what instructors deemed passing and determine if students were being passed that would not have otherwise. There also does not exist an easy way for faculty members to enter whether or not students passed in their records. Fogarty’s report also indicated that faculty members with large classes would be reluctant to have significant writing as part of the course. For Public Administration, the students meet the UWSR under the current system at a high enough rate that it is not an impediment for their graduation. Murray mentioned “writing across the curriculum.” Rustick said that having graduate writing assistants is great, but class size is unpredictable. Murray mentioned that a course he teaches with a population of half graduate students and half undergraduate students would be well-suited for this type of work, but with over 30 students, he does not always have time to work on the grammar. Graduate assistants would be helpful. Opp explained that GWA’s are not graders, but they helped her learn how to develop more effective writing assignments. LeDuc worried about SCAA support for technical writing and that instructors might feel uncomfortable
being put into this position. Rustick said that assessing is different from teaching. Gadiecke ends up editing papers. He wonders if some type of training could be offered for faculty and if the University would consider different workload formula for writing intensive classes. Neilsen agreed with the concept of training for faculty. Rustick said that many faculty members know what to do but not how to articulate. It is important to separate out the most significant corrections. Murray will take reports to Writing Skills Subcommittee.

Neilsen reported on summer pilot with Engl 3000 and 3001 in which portfolios were read first by teacher of record and an outside second reader. This was motivated partly by cost. Portfolios are read during final exams, and the number of first tier sections have expanded. There was also the issue of students receiving a passing grade in the course but then not getting their portfolios approved. Neilsen believes it was slightly less expensive. Instructional faculty did receive payment as the evaluation of portfolios was considered beyond their contract. Reader recruitment was easier. She is still waiting for data from testing office. The need to bring in a third reader (when the two scores don’t agree) decreased with the pilot. Typically with 200 portfolios, 20 will require 3rd reads. In the summer, there were 50 portfolios – about 3 3rd reads. The first tier instructors thought it was a good process because they had a say in the final score. Some raised legitimate concerns about pressure now that they are more in the role of evaluator, whereas previously they were envisioned as guides.

Opp was concerned that these instructors were getting paid extra for reviewing a portfolio of work they themselves assigned. Rustick said that portfolio readings are considered part of teaching 800 courses and how it is taught, but for these courses it was considered excess. If the University goes to this model, the instructors would have to be made aware of this expectation in advance. Neilsen also explained that the instructors have not seen the final drafts before, only earlier drafts, and have not seen the introductory essay so the portfolio evaluation does require additional work beyond teaching the class. Kravitz asked why a second tier course instructor can decide if a student passed but a first tier course instructor cannot. Rustick explained that a student is in a first tier class by choice or because of a low score on WST, so has not passed a broad scale assessment. Those in a second tier class have already passed one objective, outside University assessment at mid-level. Kravitz explained that his question was instead why an independent assessment is not required for second tier courses as well. For example, Marketing 3495 can be used to satisfy second tier. Non-business majors are not supposed to be
taking this class, but they are. Kravitz said students are voicing concerns about the inequity of tiers and WST vs. portfolios. Rustick confirmed that she also hears complaints. Neilsen commented that if writing in the discipline can be done students will only need the first tier course.

c. Seating of CIC subcommittees
All subcommittees were filled based on the following actions. Gaedicke will serve on Cultural Subgroups, Watnick on GE, Eagan on Graduate Programs and Writing Skills Subcommittee (seeking replacement), and Murray on Critical Thinking. Mitchell was volunteered for GE.
M/S/P (Opp/Murray)
Subcommittee list approved unanimously.

d. Review of CIC Policies and Procedures; any suggested changes?
M/S/P (Murray/Opp)
Section 7:2 Watnik says that the proposed crossout has implications in cases where a department offers a non-approved online GE course but the GE subcommittee has not met. Opp explained that the review of such proposals requires knowledge and background outside the regular committee duties of CIC. By leaving this clause in, proposals could potentially come to CIC without any approvals. Watnik suggested phrasing it so that committee could waive it without Senate review rather than administrative review. Eagan understood the motivating frustration, that people miss deadlines and hope to cram paperwork through. However, the greater good is served by going through the processes in the right order. Thompson mentioned a time she thought a course was approved for GE, but the online/hybrid form was not. Opp said that the new policy would force departments to take such online/hybrid courses off the schedule. Murray said communication system needs to be improved. Eagan said this would be the point of the curriculum tracking software. Murphy is not comfortable with the current “magic wand” –emergency one quarter approval – which doesn’t take committee review into account at all. She would prefer an emergency approval system in which the GE subcommittee would be approved in Spring and could vote by email. Watnik pointed out that the GE subcommittee requires no special training or knowledge and documents go to CIC before Senate. Opp asked if the procedures can be bypassed in this way, why is there a GE Subcommittee? Watnik recommended replacing “School” with “College” throughout. LeDuc asked if the description of subcommittees could be made consistent throughout with length of terms specified. Watnik clarified that by default terms on subcommittees are only one year, although bylaws could potentially be changed.
Opp suggested striking the sentence that lists evaluating student appeals as a duty of the Writing Skills Subcommittee. Murray had added that because Basic Skills Committee had been removed. Opp explained that this is now
handled as a petition process. Thompson clarified that the petitions coordinator in Sally’s office handles appeals. Murphy explained that the petition requires a letter from the student’s writing instructor that they had made multiple attempts to pass the UWSR. LeDuc made the correction that GE subcommittee meets 2nd and 4th Mondays. Opp asked if all subcommittees have approved actions go to CIC and Academic Senate. However, approvals for GE online/hybrid modification do not go to CIC. Can this sentence be removed and assumed? Watnik also made the point that actions are not necessarily Senate approved. He suggested “for consideration.” Watnik also said that subcommittees report to the committee. Opp suggested deleting this sentence. Passed unanimously.

e. Credit for Military Service referral
   CSUEB lacks a clear University policy on Credit for Military Service. A policy was drafted by Murphy and Schneider.
   M/S/P (Murray/Gaedicke)
   Murphy explained that there were multiple inconsistent descriptions of military service credit in the catalog. She then discovered there was no relevant policy from the Chancellor’s Office. They drafted a policy that seemed reasonable, supports veterans, and is understandable. It gives units for basic training, specialized training, or serving. A veteran could receive academic credit for a course at an online University while they were in the military. Schneider explained that a very small percentage of veterans have less than a year of service. The policy requires that they must be honorably discharged to cover potential misconduct issues.
   Passed unanimously.

f. Listing DCIE courses with Department courses.
   Murray and Perry are working on mechanisms to deal with this. Murray created a policy to deal with this, which was reviewed by the committee. Perry suggested that “catalog” be replaced everywhere with “schedule.” Opp said the default schedule view should be of stateside. Perry said he will make a separate course list for Extended Education and special session courses as well as a search box which will allow students to search any category of courses in case we go to extension for Summer. Perry would like Senate to take action on this so it is mandated. Opp suggested more generic language, “…such that extension and special session courses will be listed separately from stateside courses in the course list and search functions.” Other minor grammatical changes were suggested, “who” (Thompson) and “in” (Watnik).
   M/S/P (Murray/Opp)
   Passed unanimously.
6. New Business
   a. Referral to WSS
      This came from ExCom regarding a hold placed on filing for students who have not completed their writing skills requirement. Opp stated that some of the information is not exactly accurate. There was an attempt to enforce this a few years ago, in 2009 – 2010, when there were layoffs and no staff in Testing Office. There are many reasons to not put holds on. Murray will discuss with Murphy and bring in Writing Skills Subcommittee as needed. Perry will review. The time line for filing for graduation is 2 terms before graduating and any change in the catalog will not take effect until the next September.

7. From the floor
8. Adjournment
   Murray 3:46