CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM

AMENDED Minutes of the Meeting of December 2, 2013

Present: Andrew Carlos, 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: Brian Cook, Thomas Duffy

Guests: Sarah Aubert, Endre Branstad, Jiansheng Guo, Saeid Motavalli, Glen Perry, Aline Soules, Mitch Watnik

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

2. Approval of the minutes of November 18, 2013
   M/S/P (Murray /LeDuc )
   Passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Chair
   The GE website is being updated. Murray will make a statement of support for new curriculum tracking software. The ExCom meeting was shortened so that members could attend meeting on San Jose harassment incident. Therefore, CIC 7, 8, 9, and 10 were not discussed. CIC 4 is awaiting second reading.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   Nothing to report.

5. Old Business: None

6. New Business
   a. School of Engineering request
      M/S/P(Murray/Gaedicke)
      Discussion:
      Motavalli explained that the Department of Engineering was started in 2001. Since then, they have added four more degree programs. One degree program is accredited, Industrial Engineering. They want to accredit others, but accrediting authorities want to see the programs on their own, not inside a “department.” Eagan asked, that since schools are new for us, what would be inside the school? In CLASS, a “School” was made from multiple departments. Motavalli replied that each coordinator would be in charge of his/her own program. The department chair would become the school director. Eagan worried about how this fits into governance structure given
that department chair means something specific in our documents. FAC is currently working on this issue. Motavalli explained that in order to expand, Engineering needs to be more than a department. Gaedicke added that it is something a little particular about engineering since it encompasses such different disciplines, such as construction management. Establishing a “School” would allow for the big picture of engineering. LeDuc wonders if it is a chicken and egg problem, i.e. should there be a school before programs or a program first, then a school. Eagan asked how many majors Engineering has. Motavalli answered about 300. Establishing a School of Engineering will provide the structure needed to expand. Then, they can add programs in Mechanical, Civil, etc… Thompson was not clear why the title “School” was necessary. She also asked about release time to coordinators. He remarked that the proposal was similar in structure to that at San Francisco State. Motavalli said that they plan to have 1000 students and it will cost money to expand. Mitchell commented that having a School in Engineering might attract better faculty. Motavalli added that they are currently not offering students the choices of engineering discipline that they want. Opp had looked up that Engineering has 396 majors. Motavalli said the department has been pretty successful in bringing in grants and interest from companies. Eagan asked if there was a need other than accreditation for this proposal. She also added that other departments might get more attention from companies if they were to become schools. Carlos asked why a school had been established in CLASS. Eagan explained it was the choice of faculty from different departments to come together and create this structure. Thompson asked a clarifying question regarding Motavalli’s previous statement that students do not know the choices of engineering are not available. Motavalli explained that the first two years of study are similar for all disciplines. They currently don’t have the funding to get faculty for the other disciplines of engineering. He said that there is no department of engineering that offers multiple degree programs. Thompson asked if ultimately they will want to form separate departments. Motavalli responded that the proposal is to create a structure to expand to different degree programs. Hall asked, if there are no real drawbacks and anticipated benefits, why not support the proposal? Gaedicke said that it is cost neutral and simply a name change. Opp felt that the School of Arts and Media, coming from multiple departments, and the proposed School of Engineering, one department looking to expand, both have really valid reasons for calling themselves a school. It would be a plus to have a School of Engineering. LeDuc commented that it is not resource neutral because multiple coordinators would need release time. However, it could be less costly than being run as individual departments. Eagan was concerned that the proposal put the cart before the horse. She feels the individual departments should be created, and then a school formed. Thompson raised concerns about the duties of the department chair (for example, in the RTP process) given the likelihood that other schools will be proposed. How does this fit into RTP process. Motavalli said his duties would be the same as they are now. Hall thought that calling it a “School” might be a bit deceptive, since one would expect a school to have different departments and offer more than
a department. Motavalli responded that the department has made a lot of changes, and students can now choose from different majors (rather than just options).

Opp requested the following changes: 1) Effective Date is 2015. 2) Civil Engineering will soon be proposed.
The committee voted on the document with the requested changes. 9 in favor; 2 opposed; 2 abstained.

b. Liberal Arts Education discussion
Watnik put this on Excom’s agenda and explained his reasons for doing so as follows. On the Senate mailing list, Susan Gubernat sent out pieces on STEM education. On a couple of occasions, the Provost responded, and there was some disagreement. It raises the question “What is our big picture?” People like to say we are a Liberal Arts institution, but there is not a single definition. He felt it would be a useful exercise for faculty to express their views on what constitutes a Liberal Arts Education. Opp said that the AAC&U LEAP materials define the essential learning outcomes of a Liberal Arts education, adopted by CSU, similar to our Institutional Learning Outcomes. Liberal education is often confused with liberal arts education. This could be a really big discussion, but it is not clear what would be accomplished. Murray asked how such a discussion would differ from that around ILO’s. Watnik replied that the ILO’s were about specificity, and that this is more about generalization. Eagan stated that the University doesn’t really do liberal arts education. It has some components, but that is not its primary mission. Liberal arts colleges are now becoming comprehensive universities. Ideally, the values behind the ILO’s would be infused across curricula, not measured as discrete points where students get exposed to them. Pointing against a liberal arts education are graduation unit requirements, market pressure, siloing of discipline. Opp concurred that the goal would be really rich integrated experiences, but this is difficult given issues with transfer and articulation. There is a dichotomy between what we know is really rich and engaged learning and the need to put it all together in a degree. Engaging with questions about our identity as a University and if we are doing what we think we are would be appreciated by WASC. CIC is too small a venue for such a discussion, possibly the Senate as well. Murray mentioned that with Planning for Distinction and transition from quarters to semesters, that perhaps this could be a – sub-theme of these shake-ups. Eagan remarked that it is difficult to create truly interdisciplinary curriculum because of administrative difficulties to team teach. We lose capacity to do creative things because we are tied to numbers. Murray said that he teaches an upper division biology course, sensory physiology, involving physics of sound and light. He would like to team teach it with a physicist, but it is too complicated. Gaedicke is team-teaching an engineering class with Michael Lee. They worked it out so each is teaching ½ of each of two courses. Xiong said that the discussion reminded her of her freshman year Human Diversity cluster, with professors from Communications, Ethnic Studies, and Anthropology. It helped her to see the connections. She was not sure how it would work in sciences. Opp
was reminded of her experience in starting the Environmental Science program, in which she had to pull from a lot of different areas. Trying to integrate was really hard as the students needed some Chemistry, Biology, Geography, etc… The Provost would be a willing audience, having a background in Environmental Science. It is a big challenge as people are allocated to individual departments.

c. Referral on Affordable Learning Solutions
Watnik started the discussion. Soules has been the key person for Affordable Learning Solutions. There have been several small working groups around campus, but only when one gets a little publicity do the groups hear about each other. The proposal is to have a CSUALS sub-committee under CIC. Soules has individuals selected, faculty, staff, and administrators. That way they could have items referred to them and have a means of generating policy suggestions. Watnik explained that if CSUALS was instated as a regular committee, CIC would have to change its policies and procedures document, but not if they were a special subcommittee.
Murray reported current membership. Eagan felt there should be a faculty representative from each College. Soules provided documents on Members, Options, Student Issues, and Faculty Issues. Soules further explained the work of the group. The Chancellor’s office has certain criteria for such groups, e.g. the involvement of accessibility services, other stakeholders. Murray is representative from CIC. They have met twice. The University’s goal is somewhat schizophrenic: do something to make things cheaper for students and make money through the bookstore. For students, they have created “textbox tips”. RentDigital and BookNow+ allow students to order course textbook right from Blackboard. It makes it easier to place order, but encourages faculty to continue the same practices. The Library has course reserves and values instructor copies. Faculty can make persistent links to articles in Blackboard. The CSU encourages the use of MERLOT, individual textbooks, and AcademicPub where a textbook can be built from multiple resources. The price is 10 -60% of regular textbooks. For students, the primary issues are cost and prioritizing textbook acquisition. For faculty, the primary issue is requiring course readers with articles for which the library is already paying for subscription. The group discourages faculty from course readers and encourages the use persistent links. Another problem is faculty selling copies in class as this is a violation of copyright and other laws. Some faculty members order textbooks but do not reference in class. Some faculty members do not use the departmentally chosen text. Others submit textbook adoptions to the bookstore late. Eagan switched to electronic resources, in part because textbook industry offends her sensibility and offers crude content. She wants more faculty representation so that information can go back to Colleges and the word be spread. Getting people to volunteer would be CIC’s job. Opp noticed that representatives were needed from CEAS and CLASS. Soules explained that the bulk of the work of the group is being done
by administrative members. Mitchell volunteered from CEAS. (Note: in an email sent to the committee, he later retracted.) Eagan volunteered to find someone from CLASS. Guo mentioned that the CLASS library advisory committee might be a good place to look. Eagan mentioned a problem with solely relying on electronic resources -- there are always a handful of students who are not quite there with technology. Could print copies be made for these students? Soules agreed that faculty members are hesitant to get into technology hand holding. One instructor keeps electronic compilations current by giving students extra credit for each of the course modules if they can find something better.

With the recognized need for 4 slots for representatives from each College, the Affordable Learning Solutions was proposed as a sub-committee for CIC. Passed unanimously.

7. From the floor

8. Adjournment
   Mitchell (3:48 p.m.)