COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES
FEBRUARY 16, 2015

Members Present: Eileen Barrett, Andrew Carlos, Jennifer Eagan, Cristian Gaedicke, David Lopez, James Mitchell, Susan Opp, Nancy Thompson, Jing Wen Yang, Mitchell Watnik (Chair).

Members Absent: Brian Cook, Claudia Uhde-Stone (Secretary),

Guests: Sally Murphy, Glen Perry, Jason Singley, Joy Vickers, Jessica Weiss, Roger Wen, Gale Young

Meeting called to order by Chair Watnik at 2:06. At the request of the chair and in the absence of the secretary, Barrett volunteered to record minutes.

1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P Mitchell/Carlos to approve the agenda.

   Time certain new business item 5A was next.

2. Approval of the minutes from February 2, 2015.
   M/S/P Carlos/Opp to approve the minutes as amended to correct spelling of names. (8 yes/0 no/ 2 abstain)

3. Reports

   Report of the Chair: Watnik introduced Joy Vickers from the Academic Counseling Center (ACE). Watnik shared his ideas about the Curricular Procedurals Manual in the context of semester conversion. There were some suggestions about the new course form; Watnik also raised his concerns about the larger issue of prerequisites. Opp raised concerns about the new course and program proposals that continue to come to APGS.

   M/S Eagan/Opp: CIC recommends a moratorium to begin June 1, 2015 on all (state-side and self-support) new or modified courses and programs of all levels for the quarter-based system. CIC will consider exceptions to this moratorium for accreditation considerations or other compelling circumstances.

   Discussion of the motion: Members raised concerns about the timeline for the moratorium, considering the dates for senate approval, etc. Agreed that April would be too early and July 1st too late. Settled on a June 1st deadline. Agree that courses/programs already in the pipeline could proceed through the process. Eagan wondered why departments would consider new programs in light of the need to revise all programs for conversion next year.
Opp is concerned that students have stability within their programs. Thompson suggested that departments might want to try quarter versions of courses that might become semester courses. Eagan wondered if anyone has time for experimentation. Gaedicke raised about program requirements for accreditation. Watnik understands that APGS would make exceptions for certain circumstances. Motion was unanimously approved.

Time certain old business 4c was next.

**Return to chair’s report** and additional discussion of the curriculum procedures manual. Main question raised: When should semester conversion changes be course modifications? In the process of conversion, departments/programs will often redistribute the content. Singley mentioned that the semester conversion directors have been meeting with APGS staff to revisit the curriculum procedures manual and to have a process in place that is appropriate for semester conversion. Eagan suggested that we need new course forms repackaged for conversion.

Opp agreed that there are ways to streamline the process. But quarter courses are discontinuances, and we need the ability to track courses. A second issue for Opp is that many courses have drifted from their original intention and now include different components. Everything from Opp’s point of view has to be recoded. All prerequisites have to be revisited. The new software tracking system will make this process much easier. But we have to have documentation that every semester course is a new course. We cannot do a mixture of some new—they’ll all be new.

Eagan noted that we have to be able to easily identify the complexity of the modification or the ease of the transformation. Opp asked if everything is going to be considered a new program? At what point will programs need to go through CIC? Is CIC going to review every new program and consider all new courses? Watnik noted the need to consider how our own courses under quarters will articulate under semesters. Departments should auto-articulate their courses. Singley suggested a cover sheet developed by APGS that could go with new modifications and new courses. Eagan proposed a grid showing how things are redistributed; we don’t have to look at everything.

**Report of the Presidential appointee:** Sue Opp reported that the Chancellor's Office (CO) has specific terminology for how programs are structured. What we on our campus call options are actually called concentrations by the CO. Opp mentioned several issues about the relationship between a major’s core requirements and the option/concentration requirements. First, all the program learning outcomes should be covered by the core requirements.
Second, the majority (at least 50%) of the units required for the major should be in the core. Units required in the option/concentration should be fewer than those in the core for the major. The core should map the learning outcome.

Discussion: Eagan suggested that what's important is the overall programmatic integrity. Opp pointed out that often students who earn the same degree have limited courses in common because they are in a program/major with a small or no core. Singley noted if we were to strictly enforce this CO requirement that the PLOs be covered by the core courses, we would discover that there are programs with distinct degrees. Thompson wondered what would happen if we changed option to concentration on the diploma. The Liberal Studies degree has two different degrees under this definition, but she sees no need to subdivide the liberal studies into different degrees.

Opp reported that purchase orders had been submitted for curriculog and acalog, the software we had previewed at the last meeting.

**Report of University Extension:** No report

**Report of Semester Conversion:** Singley reported that the directors had met separately with deans and associate deans. All appreciate that conversion is a huge task and that we need a well thought out process. The associate deans will be instrumental in the flow of curriculum review. At its February 6th meeting, the Semester Conversion Steering Committee identified a working group to discuss how to help facilitate cross-curricular course conversions. The key is to facilitate conversations across departments and programs so that all who depend on service courses are aware of changes proposed by the departments/programs that provide these courses. The directors met with APGS staff to discuss how to develop a guide that communicates to faculty what the expectation of APGS will be. The new software should be helpful but it will not be available until fall 2015. In the meantime, faculty are requesting information about what they need to do by end of winter quarter. Barrett reported that the directors have charged FAC with developing a proposal for the new semester/ten-year academic calendar. FAC is at work reviewing semester calendars on the other CSUs and on the top CCCs from which our students transfer. Their goal is to recommend a new ten-year academic calendar that the Senate can approve before the end of this academic year. Eagan reported that the GE subcommittee conversations are being held this week. GE subcommittee will hold working meetings Tuesdays mornings 8:30-10 beginning March 3rd.

4. **Old Business:**

   a. **Course numbering for semesters**
Opp asked if Cook’s concerns had been addressed, and Watnik responded that the last paragraph of the document satisfied Brian Cook. Opp continues to have concerns about the document as written, and believes that things should be defined more clearly rather than by postscript.

M/S/P Mitchell/Barrett to postpone discussion.

c. Policy on Online Courses

Watnik reported that the policy document includes comments from Roger Wen and information from Glen Perry about how the CO defines CSU learning modes. During the discussion at senate, several raised concerns about using language from the White Paper, which doesn't have policy status. Instead, we should adopt definitions consistent with the CO and our own local policy.

M/S/P Mitchell/Eagan to replace the appendix A from the CSU Online Education White Paper with CSU Learning Modes with that provided by Perry. (Unanimously approved).

Committee discussed definition of synchronous learning and teaching strategies. The current assumption is that all online classes are asynchronous. But if/when courses become synchronous, there will be a need to identify the times of synchronous meetings in the course schedule.

At the request of Watnik, Mitchell, Eagan, and Barrett volunteered to revise the online document for CIC. They will consult with Weiss and Wen about the recommendations that have been introduced, and they will consider the two rubrics for online teaching: Quality Online Learning and Teaching (QOLT), a CSU home grown rubric (based on the Chico model) with multiple measures of required elements in online courses and Quality Matters, a rubric created by a national non-profit distinct from any campus to which our campus subscribes.

5. New Business

a. Request from Communication

M/S/P Carlos/Mitchell to approve two requests from Communication for i) new option in Communication and Media Studies and ii) revision to Communication and Media Studies. (unanimous)

6. Adjournment 3:55pm.

Time constraints prevented the committee from discussing these items under old business-- All online courses available to all CSU students (4b)—and these under new business-- Alteration of GE subcommittee meeting times (5b), Graduate Residency Requirement (5c), Minimum Course
Grade Requirement for Master’s Programs (5d), and Graduate Academic Probation and Disqualification (5e).

Respectfully submitted,

Eileen Barrett (acting secretary)