CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM

Amended Minutes of the Meeting of March 3, 2014

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, Gaozong Yang

Absent: Brian Cook

Guests: Sarah Aubert, Larry Bliss, Endre Branstad, Jack Davis, Jiansheng Guo, Thomas Hird, Glen Perry, Sophie Rollins, Angela Schneider, Mitch Watnik

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

2. Approval of the minutes of February 17, 2014
   M/S/P (Murray/LeDuc)
   Passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Chair
   Murray attended first meeting of Writing Skills Subcommittee. The proposal for blocking graduation application is generally agreed upon. It will come back to CIC soon. Another issue that was discussed was proctoring of On-line—refer to that Technology and Instruction Subcommittee.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   No report.

5. Old Business:
   a. Checking for prerequisites
      M/S/P (Murray/Opp)
      13-14 CIC 19 document edited by Murray and Opp
      Perry noticed that in the last paragraph, there is a reference to 2014 quarter courses. Murray replied that should have been crossed out and referred to the clean version. This is a step towards getting word to students and faculty and gives some time to get prerequisites formatted and cleaned up. Carlos pointed out that should there a space in between “CIC” and “8.” Opp asked if it should be referred to as an update or replacement. Rollins replied that it was just a note to herself.
      Vote: 12 “yes”, 1 “abstain”

   b. Fifth-year students and registration
Watnik and Bliss produced a draft document which was distributed to the committee. Bliss explained the document is not a request for any 5th year student to be treated as senior. Rather, those that agree to a program of advising and regular progress towards degree would be offered an incentive. The other responsibilities these students juggle lead to their being very time constrained. Treating them as seniors will give them more opportunity to find classes to fulfill their requirements. AACE is targeting students most likely to get a degree and could get list to registrar’s office. Thompson asked how many of these students have changed their major many times. Bliss did not know but said that some certainly are some wandering the University landscape. Most of them are plodding along. We are doing these students a disservice by putting information online as they try to self-advise and wind up in difficulty, wasting time and energy and money. Opp expressed her concerned about students as well but the problem exists of defining these 5th year students. Bliss stated that they are targeting students who started as first-time freshmen and didn’t graduate with their cohort. Those that seem as they will make it just fine will get offered a graduation workshop. Others have nowhere near the units they need. They will be offered a workshop to take a second look at what they are doing here. This program is focused on the middle group that clearly has a possibility of graduating within 6 years. Opp expressed concern that it is not open to all students. The two-thirds of our students who transferred to East Bay have no way to be part of this project too. This is not necessarily bad, but we need to think about it. As a policy, this document does not sufficiently define who these students are. The phrase “have the potential to graduate in 6th year” begs the questions “as determined by whom” and “defined by what.” Otherwise, other students are going to complain. Watnik said that it is a misstatement to say that transfer students are disadvantaged. They are in same boat they are in currently. Committee could make the criteria part of the background information. Eagan said that there may be unintended consequences of giving registration order they didn’t already have. Murray said most of our students are really busy, but these students might be thought of as low-hanging fruit to get to graduation. Perry made a friendly amendment to the Action requested by changing “give” to “request.” He also asked who is a 5th year student. The targeted students might be better defined by the number of units completed. A student could take courses one quarter per year for five years and maintain continuous attendance. Bliss affirmed that they are not looking at students like that. Murray asked if we can define the target population. Bliss asked for leeway. A more definitive definition in the Action Requested would make things difficult in the future as numbers and requirements are going to change. Opp was uncomfortable with that. There are students who are so many units (in total) from being able to graduate, but they are not necessarily completing major requirements. It becomes a subjective judgment as to who falls in the targeted category, which will lead to student complaints. LeDuc said that it is zero sum game of offering priority registration to some. This will necessarily move other transfer students down in priority, which is at a disadvantage. Yang is such a student herself, a transfer student, now graduating in her 6th year. She has always been able to get the classes she needed. Mitchell asked for Bliss to respond. Bliss said he would be delighted to include transfer students, but the money from the Chancellor’s office comes from a
grant targeting native students. Eagan said that a different carrot is needed, such as incentives for faculty to accept more students. Bliss agreed that there were other carrots that could be pursued and appreciate the committee taking time to talk about it. Gaedicke asked that since this is a new program, couldn’t it be good to see how it would work for one year. Thompson asked how many students are under discussion. Bliss said he doesn’t know the number of transfer students. We are talking about the native 2009 cohort. There are 790 students, and his program could advise a cohort of 400. Mitchell remarked that students now require of us a paradigm shift, and we need to reach out and help them. Bliss piloted the program with a cohort of 2008 students. There were 30 students with multiple issues. Some faculty members were willing to make changes in major or GE requirements. Watnik commented that regarding the issue of native vs. non-native students, it is hard to define what 5th year means for a transfer student. The real point of this document is to make a step towards answering Morishita’s call to improve native students’ graduation rates. This policy gives them a carrot to go to advising and get their coursework in order. Eagan is concerned with changing priority registration order, but agrees with the promise of high impact advising. It is unfair that we are judged by the number of units community college transfers bring with them. He remembered when students couldn’t graduate on time because classes weren’t being offered. This can have a big impact on students’ lives. Murray asked if we could amend to include transfer students. Eagan replied that this wouldn’t completely address problem. We would still have to amend other documents. Carlos agreed that the bigger problem is changing of priority for registration. Thompson remarked that the difference in our school’s graduation rates versus that of private colleges is intensive advising. Bliss said that they are waiving graduation fees and writing skills test fees. Carlos suggested trying the program without offering priority registration.

M/S (Murray/Mitchell)
Vote: 4 “yes”, 4 “no”, 4 “abstain”

c. GE request, C1/C3: Theater 2225
Hird came in response to two questions the committee had the last time. The version we saw did not have a course catalog description, although the one he sent did. The document under discussion today had the description. The other question was how the oral component of outcomes would be handled in this online course. Hird had consulted with Sally Murphy regarding how this was being handled in other online courses. The course includes a weekly discussion requirement. Eagan commented that the GE subcommittee has been accepting use of Discussion Boards as the oral component. Mitchell said eventually some sort of compromise will need to be reached to serve both those students who want a live lesson (online) and those for whom technology is a barrier, perhaps by archiving the live lessons. Passed unanimously.

6. New Business
   a. Discontinuance of Option in Statistical Economics
M/S (Mitchell/Kravitz)
He had not been asked to speak on these from CBE, but she approved it when it came to the College Committee. There is a lack of demand for both options. Passed unanimously.

b. Discontinuance of Option in Accounting
M/S (Murray/Kravitz)
Passed unanimously.

7. From the floor
Jack Davis brought forward for GE approval two courses: EPSY3000 (The Helping Relationship) and EPSY 3001 (Introduction to the Counseling Profession). They passed the GE subcommittee in a January meeting. Eagan said it was out of order to review them since they were not on the agenda. Watnik said they could be brought from the floor. Mitchell agreed that we should review since Davis was advised to be here by GE subcommittee chair. Eagan noticed that the maximum enrollment needs to be “35” not “45” because it is D4. Murray asked if both classes have to have a 35 student cap. Eagan said that is true of all C4 and D4 GE requirements because they include a significant writing component.
M/S (Eagan/Mitchell)
He noticed that the weights of assignments in grade determination for EPSY 3000 course was missing.
Passed unanimously.

8. Adjournment
(3:18 p.m.)