CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM

Approved Minutes of the Meeting of May 5, 2014

Present: Andrew Carlos, Jennifer Eagan, Yi He, Keith Kravitz, Danika LeDuc (Secretary), James Murray (Chair), Susan Opp, Nancy Thompson

Absent: Brian Cook, Cristian Gaedicke, Barbara Hall, Katrina Mayol, Jim Mitchell,

Guests: Sarah Aubert, Endre Branstad, Jiansheng Guo, Glen Perry, Sophie Rollins, Mitch Watnik

1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P (Murray/Opp)
   Murray requested adding information item 5b on separating extension courses on schedule. (13-14 CIC6)
   Passed unanimously.

2. Approval of the minutes of April 28, 2014
   M/S/P (Murray/Opp)
   Murray reported a typo on page 4: “clusteres” instead of “clusters.”
   Watnik requested changing mention of his name to “Senate Chair”
   Opp suggested that her intent when saying “this is larger than CIC” meant the issue potentially involves committees other than CIC.
   Passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Chair
   None.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   Opp reported that an event was scheduled for May 6th from 11 – 1 in the multipurpose room of the UU entitled “Meaning, quality, and integrity of a college degree.” This is a new part of the WASC self-study. Our ILO’s really speak to how faculty and students feel about the degrees. This will be a valuable discussion. Another one will be held on May 29th. We also need feedback from students. Watnik provided the email address for Katrina Mayol, now ASI President.

5. Information Item:
   a. Infrequently Offered Courses
      Opp reported that this document will go to the Senate for them to look at the list of courses. This sometimes results in faculty coming up with classes that they will be teaching next year. If a course hasn’t been taught within 3 years it is either removed from the catalog or appealed because they are planned to be
taught. A course can be closed out or banked if departments are not planning to teach them in the next year. Banked courses can be brought back with a memo but are invisible. Carlos clarified that they are essentially “on hold.” Aubert confirmed that a course can be banked forever. Murray asked what the official mechanism is for a course to be “completely dead.” Opp replied it is either closed out or a course discontinuance can be filed. Aubert explained that if an appeal is filed for a course to be retained and it is not taught in the following year, it is automatically discontinued.

Motion to accept.
M/S (Opp/He)
Watnik asked where the “*” in the document is explained. Opp pointed to “banked*.” Watnik suggested that, after the first use of the term “banked”, the phrase “indicated by a star” be inserted. Eagan noticed that Philosophy 4606 was on the list, even though it will be taught next year. Opp said that the list needs to change on the floor of Senate. It is banked anyway. Aubert said that a memo is needed to get it back. Eagan thought there was an interim mode of saving it for a year. Opp explained that if the class isn’t taught next year, it will remain banked. Passed unanimously.

b. 13-14 CIC 6: Separate regular academic courses from extension courses
Perry brought handouts showing mock-ups for modification request. He explained that when the Senate passed this resolution, his group promised to share developmental thoughts with CIC and ExCom before work was done so that by Fall it would be done correctly. Now students will see either Regular University courses (regular session) or University Extension, i.e. those courses that are not part of an approved degree program. He offered ALP and 7000 level courses as examples. Opp asked if PHAP courses will show up as a regular session. Perry replied yes, since they are special session academic rather than non-academic. Opp thought the problem was that the current search seemed to show that students had a lot more options than they really have. Murray said that PHAP students can’t take stateside courses, and stateside students can’t take PHAP. Perry said it was not particularly difficult to change that. Courses with the “special session designation” could be moved to the second group. Murray asked if there could be a potential problem. Perry replied only if ExCom tells me the opposite. Watnik said it shouldn’t be a problem. Eagan said that English had the same problem. Opp confirmed that it was with the 7000 courses. Carlos clarified that courses labeled with “SSD” in the course listings will be moved to Extension. Perry further explained that the search page will look very similar to the way it does now. It is not easy to modify because of the way it has been constructed. They propose adding a check box labeled “include extension classes.” Murray suggested adding a pop-up or hover text to give explanation or “you are not eligible to take these courses.” Perry said that was a possibility. Carlos raised a concern about the location of the check box on the search page. Perry thought it was okay since they did not want regular students to use it. LeDuc mentioned that affected groups, such as PHAP, should advise their students to check that box.
Opp asked if for Summer session all students would have to click the box to see their courses. Perry explained that the schedule for summer is session 1 so only DCIE courses will be seen as an extension. He also brought up two baccalaureate completion programs that will be affected, Women’s Studies and Business Administration. Students currently have a “session selection” on the search page, but they don’t use it. Murray said he could talk to Women’s Studies and Business Administration about their opinion. Perry asked if the committee was satisfied with the check box next to the Search button. Murray said yes, provided there is a way to put more information. Perry said he will know by the next ExCom meeting what is doable. Guo confirmed that students don’t know what self support is and that his student service center staff is unsure of how to deal with the situation.

Opp asked when these new features would go live. Perry said that the Fall schedule goes live on May 12th. He could slide it in when it is ready. Opp was not sure that was a good idea. Perry said that it was passed by Senate as effective with President’s signature. It seems best to start with Winter. Since this originated in ExCom, Perry wants to show them. Watnik agreed that this is a good idea if that is what they want.

\[M/S (Eagan/Murray)\]

Motion to move to ExCom as information item.

Passed unanimously.

6. New Business
   a. 13-14 CIC 32: Extension of Affordable Learning Solutions (ALS) Committee for 14-15
      Murray explained this document was to renew the ad hoc status of ALS.
      \[M/S (Murray/Opp)\]
      Opp asked if this is the right way to do this. Watnik replied that this late in the year, it is better to be safe than sorry. When it goes to ExCom, the regular subcommittee document could be presented first. If that doesn’t pass, then this document could be put forward. If it does, then this document becomes unnecessary.
      Passed unanimously.

   b. 13-14 CIC 33: Proposal to add Affordable Learning Solutions (ALS) subcommittee to the CIC Policies and Procedures
      Murray added more history, relationship to Chancellor’s Office, and description of membership.
      \[M/S (Murray/Opp)\]
      With regard to the membership, it is a relatively large committee and has one member from each college and library. Opp suggested that the stated membership has some irregularities. For instance, it is not clear how many members constitutes a full committee or if the stated members should or could be staff, faculty, or administrators. In the case of the A2E2 member, it is not clear if it should or could be a faculty or student member. Also, is APGS defined broadly to include GE and Testing? Murray explained that he based the membership
description on the existing list. Opp suggested being more specific for something that will change CIC’s Policies and Procedures. She asked if other subcommittees specify non-faculty membership. Watnik replied absolutely. Murray suggested changing it to read “one faculty representative from each college or library.” Opp asked how a quorum will be reached. Watnik explained that the Policies and Procedures for subcommittees are usually the same as that of the Senate, i.e. only faculty members count towards quorum. However, in CIC’s Policies and Procedures, Article 4 Section 2, it states “a majority of members of the committee shall constitute quorum.” It does not specify faculty members. He recommended changing it to include only faculty. Murray explained that there was no original intent to balance the committee, only to find people who might have interest in affordable learning solutions. Eagan suggested that someone could be a member for informational purposes, but not necessarily a voting member. Opp suggested wording it that “Non-voting members will include…” Watnik replied that CIC would still have to change its Policies and Procedures, because it just says “member.” Murray asked about the change in language stating one faculty representative from each college and the library. Murray currently represents both COS and CIC. Carlos suggested changing it to say “one of whom must be on CIC.” Opp suggested adding “non-voting members who don’t count toward quorum.” Murray asked if we could phrase it this way now with the intent to later change Policies and Procedures. Watnik suggested consulting Aline Soules before designating any members as non-voting. Murray will specify that one member should be a student from the A2E2 Advisory Committee. Carlos asked if any membership was specified by the Chancellor’s Office. Murray replied that the only mandate was a representative from Accessibility Services. Murray will send document back to ALS to examine membership and have it returned. Watnik learned from Aline Soules that students are currently on the subcommittee. Eagan asked from where. Watnik explained that they were appointed by ASI. Carlos noticed that this will mean a new category needs to be added to membership.

M/S (Murray/Eagan)
Passed unanimously.

c. 13-14 CIC 34: Policy on Academic Dishonesty in First-tier Writing Courses
M/S (Murray/Opp)
Opp explained that the Writing Skills Subcommittee has had issues with academic dishonesty in the portfolio for first-tier writing courses and in the writing skills test. These are not courses so a specific and common policy is needed to ensure consistency between different sections and tests. Eagan clarified that if a student commits academic dishonesty on their portfolio, they will get option “b”: be required to resubmit work or retake an exam under specified conditions and with a possible grade penalty. Opp also explained that some students do first-tier course online and need to come to campus to give written evidence that they wrote the work. If they can’t come to campus they will be required to find a certified proctored writing environment at their own expense. If there is evidence of academic dishonesty on the WST, the student will receive a failing grade on
the test, cannot retake the exam, and must take the course. In both cases, students will receive an academic dishonesty report. Eagan asked if portfolios are submitted through Turnitin. Opp did not know. Eagan said that Turnitin is an effective deterrent. Opp agreed, but explained that it doesn’t help with those taking the course online. With regard to the WST, students were citing evidence from the Internet during the exam. Watnik asked to correct some errors in the document. The acronym “UWSR” should be used rather than “GWAR.” Also these fulfill a graduation requirement rather than a GE requirement. Opp noticed that UWSR was misspelled later. She also explained that grading on the WST is as follows: LC – limited competency, DC – developing competency, and CC – clear competency. Only the latter meets the writing skills requirement. Kravitz explained that there should be language stating in the policy that students who are commit this academic dishonesty be prevented from filing for an exemption from this graduation requirement. Opp said that her office would never approve such an exemption. She also wants to have another UWSR code indicating academic dishonesty. Kravitz said that should be something written in the policy. He suggested adding a sentence “An academic dishonesty report on a first-tier writing portfolio or writing skills test will prevent a student from filing for an exemption from University writing skills requirements.” Watnik thought that the academic dishonesty report doesn’t go past judicial affairs unless student is being expelled. Opp explained that instead of a grade for the writing skills requirement, students would get an “academic dishonesty” designation. Guo said that his understanding about academic dishonesty reports was that the first time one is filed on a student it does not automatically go to judicial affairs. Opp said that in the case of the UWSR, it will automatically go to judicial affairs. Kravitz reworded the sentence “If an academic dishonesty report has been filed for the first-tier portfolio or WST, a student may not seek an exemption from the UWSR.” Passed unanimously.

7. From the floor
8. Adjournment (3:31)