CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM
Approved Minutes of the Meeting of February 17, 2014

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

Absent: Brian Cook, Barbara Hall

Guests: Lara Dungan, John Eros, Jiansheng Guo, Gigi Nordquist, Glen Perry, Angela Schneider, Mitch Watnik

1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P (Kravitz/Opp)
   Two items were added just today. Passed unanimously.

2. Approval of the minutes of February 3, 2014
   M/S/P (Murray/LeDuc)
   Murray found an extra “?” LeDuc confirmed it was a typo.
   Aye = 8, Abstention = 1

3. Report of the Chair
   Nothing to report.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   a. 120 unit exception requests:
      i. Industrial Engineering
      ii. Computer Engineering
   Opp explained that exception requests to the 120/180 unit rule is required by the Chancellor’s Office for all programs exceeding this cap. It is complicated to count all the units in major and what might double count with GE. Sally Murphy went through the above majors very carefully and found that some double counts for GE had been miscounted. These documents correct that error. Opp does not know what the final outcome will be for these exception requests. Watnik said that the Statewide Academic Senate has a resolution pending to the Board of Trustees for a blanket waiver for engineering programs. Murray asked whose signature is at the bottom. Opp answered the Provost and Chair of Academic Senate. In 2009, the Academic Senate approved engineering students to double count American Institutions code requirements as GE. Not uncommon for majors to double count as GE. For example, Engineering students use General Chemistry to meet their B3 requirement. Opp applauds Engineering, who received approval in 2008 to double count one engineering class for their written communication requirement, but did not use the
substitution because they felt their students need more English classes. For critical thinking requirement (A3), the Senate said modules in their laboratory courses could be used, but that hasn’t been done. A change now would have to be approved by GE subcommittee, CIC, and Academic Senate. Murray asked if this would have to be the case. Opp said that some campuses do waive this. However, engineering assignments are currently part of a campus-wide project assessing critical thinking. Murray asked if anything needs to be done in 2014. Opp answered that they made corrections from 2009. Also, before there was one engineering degree with two options, but now there are two separate degrees. She was not sure this paperwork needed to be submitted, but she wanted to do so. Murray asked if it should go through since the programs are in the range of units. Opp replied that the process was political. Earlier submitted documents never got approved nor denied. In Computer Engineering, a psychology class that could count for GE was approved. Murray clarified that this was for information only. Opp replied yes.

5. Old Business:
   a. Checking for prerequisites
      12-13 CIC 8 amended: Prerequisite enforcement, needs further amending/editing
      Opp said the main thing needed is clarifying the action requested. Perry had provided a report with a thorough sampling. Murray said that he read it as prerequisites shall be required. Opp responded that actions requested should match at beginning and end. It is also not clear if this should be treated as an interim measure or long term policy. Murray said that there are dates in the policy about when things are going to be done, and they haven’t. Watnik asked what hasn’t been done. Opp said that the way prerequisites are currently listed it is not possible to get such a list. Prerequisites would need to be done by March. Perry confirmed. Opp said this is a very short time frame for Fall, and very few programs modified their prerequisites when requested before. Murray suggested that those prerequisites that are enforceable could be used to make a report. Perry said that the policy seems to accept that those prerequisites that are not enforceable will default to department permission. Opp said there are finer points that programs need to consider: e.g. sophomore standing is a small window, a C or better is not possible to meet if they are currently in course. She does not want to do something that isn’t what is intended. Watnik said that this amendment was made on the Senate floor and is the current policy approved by the Senate and the President. A list of students who don’t meet the course requirements need to be provided. Opp said that creating a list is going toward enforcement (blocking). A huge amount of work needs to be done. She questions if the list is the permanent solution. LeDuc spoke to the helpfulness of the list and suggested that the Senate be approached to provide sticks and carrots for departments to modify prerequisites to enforceable. Xiong said that just because it is difficult does that mean we shouldn’t do it. Nordquist suggested simply asking if students have taken prerequisites and then having those who haven’t stay after. Opp said there is an issue with class size. Perry said that for “work in progress” a report can be re-run after grades are in. The Chancellor’s Office built a process to throw them out of the class, but it will not be automatic. Instructors still have potential to let students stay. The system provides
verification. How we go about building the infrastructure to do so and how seriously departments take it depends on what the intent of the Senate is. The discussion when this first went to the Senate floor was about enforcement. The approved policy is considered a compromise position while the impact might be evaluated. If everything were to be built in, it would be a 5 or 6 month project. The intent is not to build something technological that treats different classes in different ways, e.g. don’t want to penalize Science students while CLASS students keep going. Perry wants to enforce prerequisites but not block registration. There is not much time to affect Fall 14, and the timing gets tighter the longer the debate goes on. Opp is right; it is a lot of work. Perry’s work will produce a report that faculty receive but potentially may not use. There is the possibility that a lot of resources will be used on a project that the University really didn’t want. Perry wonders if there is the commitment to go beyond the list and use it for enforcement or advisement. Murray thought this document was evidence of that commitment. Perry said it is confusing that the top and bottom differ. Kravitz is concerned with: 1) lecturers not checking prerequisites, 2) it being too late for students to find replacement course and trying to find GE classes that fit their schedule, and 3) students being kicked out of class at last minute and losing financial aid. These are unintended consequences that have not been explored or discussed. Additionally, accessibility services spend thousands of dollars adapting textbooks that may not get used. Departments, chairs, and Deans need to discuss these issues. There should be a committee to hash out details of when and how to go to prerequisites. Opp asked what do you do with a document that has conflicting actions requested and may not be implementable as it was changed on the Senate floor. Watnik answered that those courses that have enforceable prerequisites should be identified. For all the other prerequisites that are not enforceable, departments should be notified. Opp replied that constitutes thousands of courses. Eagan suggested that CIC could pass a policy that supersedes this one. A committee is needed to hash out impact of policy on students and enrollments. Extensive work is required to prevent a crash in enrollments or jam up students from enrolling. Murray responded that baby steps are better than no steps. Opp suggested if that route is pursued, there should be a task force in each college, so the faculty can go through and divide and conquer, rather than wait for one person to go through 3000 courses. Murray suggested convening such an inter-college task force, leaving the policy, and continuing to define prerequisites. Opp said that there is no way it can be done for Fall of 2014. A more realistic timeline is needed. Perry agreed that this is no longer realistic. Even Winter could be difficult. Since it has to be based on current catalog, it might not work until Fall 2015. Opp said if we convene a group, it would have to move really fast. Watnik suggested that College Curriculum committees serve as the College this role, although not all departments have representatives. Eagan liked that idea and suggested CLASS (in which not all departments are represented on Curriculum committee) can figure it out. Fall 2016 would need to be the date in the amended policy. Anything else seems excessively quick. That work can be done next year for the next catalog. The bulk of the policy will remain intact. Opp clarified that the College Curriculum Committees will receive a report from Perry of every relevant course and listed prerequisites. Eagan said by approaching it program by program, it
is not overwhelming. Opp clarified that we are updating the policy. If the prerequisite revisions are completed by July 2014, the policy can be implemented by Fall 2015. If not, it will have to wait until Fall 2016. Murray said so we have to propose a new policy. Opp suggested that the “action requested” be updated. Rather than requiring prerequisite coursework, it should be that courses can be checked. Lower division can be a problem for transfer students. Opp also asked who is responsible for informing students. Perry suggested inserting something somewhere visible in the catalog stating that the policy is changing to enforceable but can be overridden by instructor permission. Murray stated that the current policy doesn’t have to say who will inform and by what methods. Opp said that no one is following up on this. Kravitz brought up a concern about STAR students. Opp said that transfer students may have lower division courses left to do. Schneider said her office can inform students through updates to the website. Eagan explained it is tough to tell people what to do in policy documents authored by CIC that then go through Senate. CIC can’t govern other entities. It can recommend College Curriculum Committees take up prerequisite review and get organized. Opp asked if College Curriculum Committees will do this. Guo responded that if it is their job to find enforceable prerequisites, they can do it, but only departments can actually change prerequisites. He said that as a member of CBE’s College Curriculum Committee, she can announce the possibility of such a list.

b. Senate chair referral regarding fifth-year students and registration
   i. 11-12 CIC 6 and 11-12 CIC 4 need to adhere; policy for how students are selected needed

Murray explained that Bliss said he would provide a mechanism for selecting students for this program. Opp voiced her concern that it moves some students up but pushes others further down. There could be students that don’t need that advising and are in this situation through no fault of their own. There can be unintended consequences whenever registration order is modified. We have to be careful we are not harming others. Watnik said that the consensus was that it was justified. The group under discussion is super-juniors. A good number of students are caught in a vicious cycle and need class X to graduate. They can only take it at a particular time and have not yet earned senior status, so by the time they can register for the appropriate section, the class is closed. LeDuc said that the number 220 was too small (not necessarily reaching all interested and eligible students) and too big (will advising really be intrusive/intensive?). Kravitz said without earlier registration, students become disincentivized. Eagan said she understands intent, but it is not easy to change registration priority. It is an advantage some students get for doing something extra. It might make more sense to identify classes that are needed and make more sections or encourage faculty members to take extra enrollment. Kravitz said the students would be put at the end of senior group and are currently stuck in Junior status. Opp was concerned that the way the document reads – fifth year and beyond – students may not have even reached junior level. In essence, this will make a larger block of seniors. She is not in favor of this. We need to try and identify which classes need more sections. LeDuc was worried about 450 other students. Perhaps they can be
identified as such if on waitlists for special consideration. Watnik explained that the group in the referral would be juniors since to be considered they must be able to graduate within 6 years with 17 unit cap. This will not move part-time students up in registration priority. The program would be voluntary and require sign up and follow-through. Bliss will bring a more concrete proposal.

c. 13-14 CIC 15: Request for curriculum tracking solution
Opp was not sure an action requested is needed. We need to find out if information is available since we don’t have a system. So, a taskforce is needed to look into this. It could be stated as “We need to look at potential solutions for these problems.” Faculty members are constantly asking where their proposals are in the approval process. The current system is not workable, especially if we move to semesters, without hiring more staff. Eagan agreed that the request might be overkill. What is needed is a document of support for looking at some potential solutions. All possible ones could be examined, and it be determined that none are suitable. Murray stated he was not sure any of these concerns were precluded by this document. Opp stated that action by Academic Senate was not necessarily needed. Eagan asked if the target audience was Academic Affairs. Mitchell replied that the goal is to marshal support from Senate. Watnik said that we are not authorized to consult with administration. This needs to go to Senate. Mitchell stated that he does not want it to be perceived as an endorsement of purchasing or of any particular product. Eagan concurred that the document sounds really good. Opp said faculty involvement is necessary. Murray suggested that Academic Affairs would come up with solutions and come back to CIC. Opp said we should ask for people to serve on a group to evaluate the proposals. Murray was not implying Academic Affairs do all the evaluations, catalog, line them up, and show them to CIC. Opp would prefer faculty to actually do it. She suggested some possible language: “report back to CIC with solution”, “involve CIC”, and “faculty should be involved with the evaluations” Perry suggested it be an ad hoc committee of Information Technology. Opp thought it was really a curriculum issue. Perry replied they might have interest and knowledge. Carlos said that they might be faculty with no experience with curriculum. Eagan we would want some “dumb” users, to choose a product that has explanations. Carlos clarified that this is a request for information or proposals. Opp said a list of functionalities needs to be created and go to purchasing when there will be an open bid process. Passed unanimously to go to Senate.

d. 13-14 CIC 14: Add/drop dates for 5 week classes
Murray had previously had some facts wrong. He asked ExCom to refer it back to CIC. There will be two add/drop periods. It is now explicit that there be a last day to drop followed by a last day to add. The withdrawal date is proportional to where it is in 10-week sessions. Watnik asked if “day of instruction” should be changed to “academic day” so that it would read “5th academic day of the session.” Carlos noticed a typo in the background information; “tuition” was misspelled. Dungan had a question about the withdrawal date in “action requested”, is it at the end of third week? Schneider said in 10-week sessions it is at the beginning of the 7th
week, so it is the same percentage. Watnik asked if there were no separate withdrawal dates for 5-week sessions previously. Schneider answered that they have had separate withdrawal dates that were longer in percentage than in the 10-week sessions. Murray set dates to be proportional to a 10-week class. Carlos suggested “week of session” rather than “week of instruction.” Dungan was supportive of this policy because nursing students are affected. Perry warned that students who drop 2nd session class may have insufficient units for financial aid. This is an attempt to make a policy appropriate and effective for everyone. The number of 5-week sessions may increase to help students to move faster. Petitions of students disadvantaged from financial aid may increase. Schneider thought this policy lets students drop themselves; it is not administratively done. Perry said that MyCSUEB activities are scheduled as an appointment. If it doesn’t totally doesn’t disrupt Nursing’s life, we are probably okay.
Passed unanimously.

6. New Business
   a. 05-06 CAPR 8 revised: Formation, Dissolution, Merger, or Name change of Academic Units
      i. CAPR/CIC/FAC working group draft update
         Murray said this document will be in review by CAPR and FAC. It was worked on to correct processes that were done in the wrong order. Opp said that Step 7 is incorrect. It should say that the University Curriculum Coordinator forwards it to AVP of APGS, who forwards it to Provost, who then brings it to the Academic Senate.

   b. New Subject Matter Preparation Program in Music request
      M/S (Mitchell/Murray)
      Eros was happy to explain further. Opp spoke in favor of this, commenting on how important having music in schools is.
      Passed unanimously.

7. From the floor
8. Adjournment
   (3:51 p.m.)