CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM

AMENDED Minutes of the Meeting of April 28, 2014

Present: Andrew Carlos, Jennifer Eagan, Cristian Gaedicke, Barbara Hall, Yi He, Keith Kravitz, Danika LeDuc (Secretary), Katrina Mayol, Jim Mitchell, James Murray (Chair), Susan Opp, Nancy Thompson

Absent: Brian Cook

Guests: Endre Branstad, Linda Dobb, Jiansheng Guo, Sally Murphy, Glen Perry, Sophie Rollins, Aline Soules

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

2. Approval of the minutes of April 7, 2014
   M/S/P (Murray/LeDuc)
   5 yes, 2 abstain

3. Report of the Chair
   Murray introduced Katrina Mayol, President of ASI and new student representative for CIC. A second student representative is being sought.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   None.

5. Information Item:
   a. Referral regarding second-tier writing courses (CIC)
      i. 13-14 WSS 1: Approved Second Tier Writing Courses
         WSS asked that these courses be listed somewhere on the class schedule each quarter. Three courses have been approved. Kravitz noted that SCI 3010 has not been offered for 5 years. Carlos commented that therefore really only one course is available (MKTG is for business only.) Murray asked how to have the courses listed. Rollins suggested asking Sarah Aubert.

6. Old Business:
   a. ASI Resolution on Academic Advising
      Dobb explained that the University is adopting a system from the Educational Advisory Board in which all sorts of advisors can put notes in the same place. There will be an advisor day luncheon on May 22nd. The new system will be piloted with
Theater and Dance, Physics, and CBE. Carlos asked if this would be separate from Peoplesoft. Dobb said that the data feeding it will come from Peoplesoft. Opp said that the name of the program is Student Success Collaborative. Dobb passed out a sheet describing all of the types of advising at East Bay. Opp said that there is a problem that this is not visible to students. Bliss remarked that in advisor notes the advisor can check a box to send a copy to the student. Mayol will inform ASI. Thompson said that in the meantime, she is unable to put notes in. Opp suggested this might be because she does not have full advisor access. Bliss commented that he likes this new process because it is much simpler, the staff will also be using it, and everyone will be on the same page. Guo said that advisor notes initially only worked for department chairs, but the University’s current policy on general faculty use is not clear. An authoritative message is needed. Guo also mentioned another link in Peoplesoft that allows entry of NetID to search for students, but most faculty members don’t have access to it. We want faculty to have access. Murray said that the Biological Science graduate advisor has written a document explaining how to get access. Eagan suggested that a NetID field be added through MyCSUEB. Dobb said she would work with Perry on this. Opp commented that this issue needs greater involvement than that of just CIC, possibly ExCom or SSAC. Murray said it was his intention to ask Senate Chair Watnik to form taskforce. Opp also encouraged all departments to work on their roadmaps.

i. WASC Educational Effectiveness Report
Eagan remarked that in looking at the report from the taskforce in 2009, she saw many good suggestions that have not been followed up on. In fact, we have gone in the opposite direction of many of the suggestions. Advising has not become more centralized. Many web-based things are overdue. The next report needs concrete outcomes and money to enact them. Opp said that there are consultants on campus working on what happens to students when they apply until they graduate. We are working on/have made progress on degree progress reports, advisor reporting system, a new building with a one stop shop environment, and more consolidation. Murray asked if CSU campuses share software. Perry replied that campuses do share software. However, we can’t just pick up one and expect it to work. We always have to modify, and often the software doesn’t do everything it is advertised to do. He further explained that we had the tools to do degree progress reports in 2006, but not the resources to maintain what we have. The suggestion was to make GE function before it was expanded to the majors. The issue is transfer students, and their degree audit never looks right.

ii. Development of roadmap for advising
Opp explained that degree roadmaps, clearly showing what students need to do for their major and GE were due two weeks ago. Faculty members have been working hard on this. Mayol explained that as a freshman, she followed GE advising, but would have been better served taking Chem
and Bio concurrently, Mitchell asked if all this would be posted and eventually hyperlinked. Opp said that was the vision.

7. New Business
   a. 13-14 CAPR 13: Formation, Dissolution, Merger or Name change of Academic Units
      i. Referral from the Executive Committee
         Change proposed to remove from point 9: “If it is determined that Senate review is needed, …” Senate Review is always needed. MSP (Murray/Kravitz) Passed unanimously.
         Opp proposed that CIC have its own document endorsing this. MSP (Opp/Eagan) Passed unanimously.
   b. Affordable Learning Solutions (ALS) subcommittee discussion
      Soules explained that her group has received a grant out of the Chancellor’s office which will expire at the end of the next academic year. Murray explained that there are two questions for the committee. The first is should we extend ALS as an ad hoc committee. The second is to whether CIC Policies and Procedures should be changed to make it a permanent committee. Eagan asked if the grant for next year is like that for this year. Soules replied that the money runs out in 2015. The Chancellor’s Office put out another call for faculty to use alternatives from a list of partners. Soules attended the ALS conference with Gretchen Keer, also of the library, and noted that there has been no data collected on the project. She proposed a call for hiring students to examine traditional course readers to determine how much of the content is already in the library. The findings could influence what we decide to buy or what faculty use. Eagan asked for clarification on what would be acceptable alternatives. Soules referenced the link to webpage with alternatives (Murray displayed for all to see.) Eagan asked about proposing to use existing library resources and/or electronic reserves. Soules said library resources were fine. Eagan clarified that essentially free stuff was acceptable. Soules said to make sure materials were totally free and totally copyright free. She will include in the call to faculty the idea that if someone has a plan and doesn’t see it listed, that they should contact Soules. Part of the reason CSUEB got the grant was because of the promise to use what Chancellor’s Office is recommending. Soules will select the winning proposals before Summer. Eagan commented that her work on this in the past allowed her to replace her most expensive textbook.
      ALS as an ad hoc subcommittee of CIC next year.
MSP (Murray/Eagan)
Passed unanimously.
ALS to be a permanent sub-committee of CIC
MSP (Mitchell/Eagan)
Eagan clarified that this will require a change in bylaws. Murray replied yes.
Passed unanimously.
Murray will draft the change in Policies and Procedures.

Murray remarked that this is the first time there were more applications for clusters than needed. Murphy explained that the criteria used to select the clusters are contained in the cluster vetting sheet and rating sheet. (Murray displayed.) There are two types of clusters, those for specific majors and those for the general student population. The GE subcommittee discussed each proposal. Members identified those that received their lowest ranking. Clusters designed for majors were approved as a group. These typically serve students in high unit majors that need to start working on their major requirements immediately. When the cluster system was first adopted, faculty were given stipends to work together to integrate the courses. This has not happened for several years. This year, the Provost has allocated money to compensate faculty to integrate their cluster courses for four days in the Summer, such that the experience is not a learning coincidence, but truly a learning community. When that was the policy, we had an 83% retention for freshmen. The present administration is more supportive. Murray brought up the recent protest against fees at Long Beach, and that students don’t know what good A2E2 funds are doing. Murphy agreed that we haven’t done a good job about explaining how the money is being used to help students. Murray suggested that Mayol could put this forth through ASI. Mayol said that she likes A2E2. Other campuses are having issues and discussing student fees. At East Bay, students have equal say about how the money is spent. Eagan is concerned with earmarks for technology in San Diego. The more students are putting forward, the less the legislature has to support the CSU. Arts, science, and technology benefit at expense of other disciplines. Eagan brought up that a cluster that was not chosen is in part funded by the Asian American Pacific Islander group. Kim Geron wanted to make a pitch for it. Eagan rated it highly. Is the title “Got rice?” – the problem? It is a cluster on the Asian American experience and includes an ethnic studies, literature, and theater class. Hall remarked that it is an awful title. Carlos said it was a meme from a few years ago. It sounds like a really
interesting cluster. Murphy: replied that it got 4 negative votes. Murray said that if we reconsider one, we would have to reconsider all. He asked what limits the number of clusters that can be offered. Murphy explained that the number of clusters needs to meet projected enrollment. She subtracts from expected freshmen class how many typically enroll in majors’ clusters and takes a stab at others to determine how many 90 student learning communities are needed. It is not impossible to take another cluster out, but it is a problem for colleges since Fall class schedule was due. Thompson asked why it is necessary to keep cluster enrollment at 90 instead of 60. Murphy explained that this number guarantees sufficient enrollment for GS, English, communication, library… i.e. supports all components of a learning community and guarantees that all are enrolled. For smaller major clusters, such as physics, students are folded into another learning community. Music students are merged with the science behind music cluster. If there are more clusters than we need, either a cluster gets cancelled or a series of clusters get underenrolled. Not many students were selecting that cluster [Got rice?]. Mitchell said that we voted against it, because there was not enough enrollment last year. Murphy explained the term “wicked problems” – problems that are complex, have no real solution, and are interdisciplinary. Freshmen begin to learn research skills, interdisciplinary approaches, how people look at problems, and have meaty year-long discussions. If library courses are to be integrated, the cluster needs something that requires research.

Action requested: approval for 3 years.
MSP (Mitchell/Opp)
Passed unanimously.

8. From the floor
9. Adjournment
   Mitchell (3:07)