1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P (Murray/Kravitz)
   Murray suggested moving 6g to after 6b.
   Passed unanimously
   Murray suggested moving 6h to end.
   Passed unanimously.

2. Approval of the minutes of January 6, 2014
   M/S/P (LeDuc/Murray)
   LeDuc requested that the date of former minutes be changed to 2013.
   Carlos noted that under 6C, the word “entire” should be changed to “enter.”
   Amended minutes passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Chair
   Murray reported that Opp was unable to attend today’s meeting. As such, the prerequisite and curriculum tracking software discussions will continue at the next meeting. With Under item 6e, the WSS needs an elected member of CIC. With regard to 5a and b, a meeting has been scheduled to coordinate policies for new academic units.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   Opp not present.

5. Old Business:
   a. Updated Referral regarding Formation, Dissolution, Merger, or Name change of Academic Units
   Murray continues to work on these with chairs of CAPR and FAC.
   b. Referral on Procedures for Proposing Schools
      i. 13 – 14 FAC 4
      Murray continues to work on these with chairs of CAPR and FAC.
c. Checking for prerequisites
   i. 12-13 CIC 8 amended: Prerequisite enforcement, needs further amending/editing
      1. Report on what is possible in PeopleSoft (Glen Perry)
         Murray explained that the current policy is self-contradicting. Acting request says that prerequisites shall be required, yet all that is really instructed is to send information to instructor. Issues around implementation need to be discussed. Perry provided report about implementation, specifically problems with loose language in prerequisites. Perry provided written information and examples, such as the types of data elements that could be used to describe a prerequisite for a course: minimum grade, co-requisites, limiting courses to majors, etc… Peoplesoft determines if the student meets the condition on the day of registration. For example, if a course is limited to biology majors, a student who is currently a chemistry major, but intends to switch majors would be blocked. The department can override by giving permission or the student can wait to register until their major is officially changed. The report gives examples of enforceable and unenforceable prerequisites. An exact list is needed for all courses. Murray suggested that in the future, when a new course is proposed, the choices for enforceable prerequisites will be given. Perry agreed and said that this might be good for curriculum tracking software rather than paper forms. He continued that there are only certain times of year that you can submit curriculum changes that impact next catalog. There will have to be a policy while phasing in the list of changed prerequisites. Eagan thanked Perry for the thorough table. She said that the action requested itself is vague. Are classes required to have prerequisites? It should be up to departments what are prerequisites, how they are listed, and how they should be enforced. She is concerned about actually blocking registration based on prerequisites, since transfer students are often listed as freshmen for at least two quarters. This is problematic for courses requiring upper-division standing. Enforcement is not nearly as important as getting students into classes. Murray advocated for a list of students who don’t meet prerequisites. Xiong said it would be better to know three months in advance that you can’t take a class to give time to look at other classes. However, as a Biology major, she appreciates the need for prerequisites. Opp previously gave Murray a list of problems. Not sure if CIC would have to have a policy. Perry explained that a policy that is more descriptive rather than a broad statement will let him go back to the staff with a mission to try and enforce prerequisites the best we can. Prerequisites that can’t be enforced via Peoplesoft could potentially be enforced by the departments. There are some other issues: 1) what courses should use EPT/ELM, 2) the legality of using student groups to identify cohorts, 3) are statements such as “not open to students who have taken X” being enforced, 4) articulation of lower division courses that are roughly equivalent to our upper division courses. Departments have to think about whether or not their prerequisites still make sense, need to be there, and are having a positive impact on instruction. Murray stated that Opp previously requested departments modify pre-requisites and that this document will help them do that. Perry agreed that this was the hope in providing examples. There remains the option of having some current prerequisites be “suggested” if they can’t be “enforced.” Murphy requested that GE
be considered. Overarching prerequisites for upper division GE exist, but no individual course description lists these. The GE subcommittee needs to rethink. Eagan wants information about prerequisites to get to the students, even if the computer doesn’t block. She is concerned about blocking transfer students, in particular. Murray asked if differences in policy and expectations exist campus-wide could these be implemented – not course by course, but department by department. Perry answered “not really.” Fairness across the University has engendered huge discussion on Senate floor. If prerequisites are not enforceable, what message are we sending the students? Murray replied that all prerequisites could get enforced; the question is whether with the computer blocking registration or a list of students not meeting the requirements sent to the instructor. Perry further explained that Peoplesoft will be used to produce a report from a shadow version, a copy the students don’t see. Reports will need to be run when there is no registration activity. PEM is currently trying to identify four points during the registration cycle in which to run these reports and distribute them to whomever should get them based on policy. The only practical way to do this would be to turn prerequisites all on or all off, university wide. Murray is personally very concerned about prerequisites and has been agitating for them. To look up each student registered for the class and determine if they meet the prerequisites would be very time consuming. If he were to receive a list from PEM, he would be happy to talk to that smaller group of students and determine if the course is appropriate for them. LeDuc also advocated for the list since that gives the power to the department to decide how they want to use prerequisites. Xiong said that a list of prerequisites shows up on MyCSUEB when she registers for classes. Eagan agreed that a list will equate to high-impact advising and doesn’t want unfilled classes. Xiong said that the important thing is to communicate to students. Guo gave an example of how things are confused currently. A student who needs remedial English failed 800 but was able to enroll in 3000 and pass. Murray said he will distribute report from Perry to motivate faculty to update prerequisites.

6. New Business

a. 13-14 CAPR 7: Discontinuance of the Pre-Physical therapy certificate
Murray asked how many students are enrolled. Beal answered “0.”
M/S (Murray/Eagan)
Yang asked if this will affect students graduating. Beal explained that since a doctorate is now required to practice, it is not helpful to have a certificate. Passed unanimously.

b. 13-14 CAPR 8: Discontinuance in Latin American Studies Major
M/S (Murray/Eagan)
Murray explained that there is low enrollment. The department plans to advise currently enrolled students through graduation. Passed unanimously.

c. Senate Chair referral regarding fifth-year students and registration
Bliss explained that the University (and the CSU system) is trying to find ways to help students graduate. They have started a pilot study of intrusive
advising for 5th and 6th year students who have not achieved senior status. If the student participates in the intrusive advising, the University will cover cost of graduation filing and WST. Most of these 5th year students were by no means full-time and typically had 2 or 3 part-time jobs. As such, they are very time-constrained. So, it would not work to meet with them and map out which courses to take each quarter. They need as much flexibility as possible. Therefore, it is proposed that students who are part of this program of regular academic advising be allowed to register as if they had senior status. Eagan asked if that meant students with fewer units would jump over those with more. Xiong asked if this would constitute priority registration. Bliss explained that they are asking that they be treated as if they were seniors. Eagan responded that that is a priority status and that we have a precedent of giving priority to certain groups. Murray clarified that this would give them lower priority than what we currently considered Priority Enrollment. Xiong said she would be okay with that since they are taking initiative. Hall asked for some numbers or percentages. Bliss said they received a grant from the Chancellor’s Office. There are 690 students in this group, and they are planning to make the offer to 220 of them. One group of students is logically making progress toward their degree. Another group is unlikely to get the degree. Their focus is on the middle group through offering help with study skills and financial aid. Balgas explained that the ultimate goal is to get them to graduate in 6 years. Perry said that he is philosophically neutral, but from an administrative standpoint, he would need clarity. Rather than discuss 5th year or 6th year, he would need to know quarters completed. Murray offered instead that the students could be designated by being enrolled in this program, which needs a name. Perry said that this discussion is about AACE designating a group of students to receive priority enrollment. CIC needs to review 11-12 CIC 6 and amend it to allow for this new student group. (CIC looks at document.) Murray asked if it should be added as a point E. Perry said it should be added where they should be in order of priority. Eagan was concerned that this needs to be offered to everyone and not used as a mechanism to pick students who will succeed. In giving something this significant, we don’t get to pick the population. Murray said we need a set of rules codified. LeDuc asked how this number, 220, was chosen. Bliss replied it was based on how many students could be advised. Watnik said those who are going to graduate are seniors and don’t need this help; others won’t take advising anyway. Carlos said that if a program is being created, we need to take a step backwards and decide what kind of program we want to create. Murray explained that it is in response to a mandate from the Chancellor’s Office to improve graduation rates. We do need a set of rules. Perry explained that it is in fact 11-12 CIC 4 that needs to be revised. Murray concluded with the discussion that some work needs to be done to generate a plan for how students will be identified for the program in an objective manner. Bliss offered to develop these rules and report to CIC.

d. Senate Chair referral regarding second-tier writing courses
Rustick explained that the list has not changed. Three courses are currently identified: Engl 2003, Sci 3010 (which has not been offered), and Mktg 3495,
which is for business majors only. Watnik said nothing wrong with these if they are the approved courses are being offered. Murray said CIC can address this.

c. Senate Chair referral regarding Writing Skills Subcommittee issues
Murray said that WSS needs one elected member from CIC. Murray will serve in this role. With regards to posting agendas, Rollins explained that given a draft, she could format it and post it.

f. Discussion of holds on graduation filing for students lacking USWR progression
Rustick explained that a question has come up about WST. There is a CSU-wide GWAR – graduate writing assessment requirement. Students on our campus satisfy this by passing WST or passing class with portfolio option. There was a brief attempt (one year) to hold students to satisfy before completing 90 units. The problem was with transfer students. Advisors were also able to remove hold. There is no objection to implementing a hold on graduation filing. The questions are who puts hold on and how will it be maintained. Murphy didn’t think advisors could remove that hold. Rustick said it was only for a short time, but that the same kind of anxiety might come up again. Murray thought that having a hold would be a wake-up call. Rustick replied that students will try to get around a problem. Yang said that is not the students’ fault but instead that of the person lifting the holds. She sees a problem with students trying to file two quarters ahead but are fulfilling requirement then. Rustick said that trying to pass the requirement in the final quarter may extend students’ time to graduation. Murphy said that Committee on Student Success found the biggest barrier to graduation was the writing skills requirement. Students are waiting until last or second to last quarter. Rustick said that she doesn’t know the size or nature of the problem, i.e. if they haven’t attempted or can’t write well enough. Eagan thinks there is a fairly sizable informational gap in what the WST is. Some faculty members don’t know why students should complete it as juniors. Student success committee should publicize this and give incentives to take it earlier rather than later. Murphy explained it does come up under “Things to Do” on MyCSUEB. Bliss said that at the request of Linda Dobb, last year they tried to entice students to take test and pass. Last spring, there were over 1200 students with more than 90 units who had not taken the test. They were invited to attend a SCAA workshop and have their fees waive. 85 did it; 48 actually passed. During Fall, there were 790 students with more than 90 units who had not taken the test from the ’09 cohort. 85 accepted the offer; 40 passed. Of the ’10 cohort, there were 795 students. 125 went to the workshop. Murray asked if CIC can do something. Rustick explained that they invited students who failed the test once to a 3-week extended training. However, the pass rates were not high enough to warrant the expense. Nothing we have done seems to have solved the problem. WSS can do more advertising to advisors and chairs that the pass rates are fairly low. Rustick is not sure why they don’t go into classes. Students leave without degrees because of it. Murray asked for the students’ input. Xiong said she came in Fall ’09 and was told in GS to take in Senior year. It could be put on “To Do” list earlier.
Students should be urged to take Engl 1001 and 1002. She got advice through her EOP advisor. Bliss explained that it is instructive to know that the problem doesn’t seem to exist at SFSU. They immediately labeled it the JEPT test – Junior English Proficiency Test. It is part of the culture to take it in Junior year. Xiong said that it is not that difficult. Rustick said that the pass rate of 50% indicates that it is difficult and is part of the anxiety, even with free workshops. It brings up a larger question, whether to change the test or lower the test. Yang liked the idea of changing the name. She came in as a transfer student and learned from a friend that she needed the WST to graduate. She communicated this to other students, some of whom did not pass. She recommends the free workshops or class route. Xiong said that students need to know earlier on that they need to take this. Students don’t feel it is important. Rustick said that transfer students don’t typically take 1001 or 1002, so more information may be needed for transfer students. She does not know the numbers of native vs. transfer in meeting this requirement. Perry said that PEM sends letter reminding students they have not satisfied requirement, but they are not reading the email, which speaks to larger issues with student communication. At the request of the Senate Chair, they are looking at creating not a registration hold, but a block on their ability to become a candidate for graduation to reinforce idea that you need to take WST. The hold is removed when the student signs up to take the test. The internal policy is that students get three chances. Yang asked how many times WST is offered per year. Rustick answered about every two weeks. Murray asked if there was a timeline for recommendation to CIC. Rustick said that WSS is meeting in two weeks. Perry said this can be viewed as an intermediate step, that is not as bad as blocking enrollment.

g. 13-14 CIC 14: Add drop dates for 5 week classes
Murray explained that 5 week classes can go pretty fast and can be chained together, but that there is only one enrollment.
M/S (Murray/Carlos)
Carlos asked if this would apply to summer. Severet said that nursing likes the proposed policy. The old one had students dropping before they added the second one. Two independent add/drop periods are needed. Schneider asked the committee to think about the possible negative consequences of changing the dates. If a student is enrolled full time and drops one of their 5 week classes, their financial aid can be affected (because they may not be able to find another class to replace it), and the University needs to run another cycle because student fees can be changed. No other CSU has a separate enrollment period during standard year – only during summer. Murray asked is summer is different because of full-time enrollment. Schneider explained that add/drop is now 11 instructional days into the quarter. This will make a new add/drop period after census.
Approved: 7
Opposed: 2
Abstained: 1

h. 13-14 CIC 15: Request for curriculum tracking solution
M/S (Eagan/Murray)
Motion to table to next meeting.
Passed unanimously

i. From GE credit
GE credit area D4
M/S (Murray/Eagan)
Murphy said the GE subcommittee had no concerns or objections.
Passed unanimously.
New course request “America on Stage”
M/S (Murray/Kravitz)
Carlos pointed out that there was no catalog description. Murphy said she
would have to go back and look but has syllabus. Murray asked if the course
is online, how the oral communication requirement will be addressed.
Murphy said D4 courses must have significant writing assignments and
opportunities to improve oral communication. She said it is a hybrid not
online, so the oral communication will be done in person. Eagan asked if it is
clear that it is a hybrid class. Carlos said “online” is checked, not “hybrid.”
The application does not say anything about meeting in person, so maybe we
are looking at an older application. Murphy said that this is the only
application we have, and she needs to look at this again. Cook said that the
“not on-line part” is seeing live play and performances. Murphy said this
needs to go back to Theater department.

7. From the floor
   None

8. Adjournment
   (3:47 p.m.)