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I. 2001-2 Committee On Instruction and Curriculum: Membership

Terrence Kelly (Chairperson), Philosophy
Evelyn Padua Andrews, Enrollment Services
Hadi Behzad, Management and Finance
Miguel Castaneda, Associated Students
Peter Claus, Anthropology
Barbara Paige, Ethnic Studies
Fung-Shine Pan, Management and Finance
Kristin Ramsdell, Library
Jeff Seitz, Geological Sciences
Kelly Steele, Biological Sciences
David Stronck, Teacher Education
Carl Bellone, Presidential Appointee
Nancy Thompson, History (quarter replacement for Peter Claus)
Joy Bhadury, Management and Finance, (quarter replacement for Hadi Behzad)
II. 2001-02 DOCUMENTS:
Committee on Instruction and Curriculum

1 Advice on Proposal for a Voluntary Pause of Curricular Change Proposals

Comment: The review of the General Education Program would be carried out in the 2001-2 academic year by CIC. Given that this review would be extremely time-consuming, CIC asked departments to voluntarily postpone non-essential curricular changes until the 2002-3 academic year. This item was passed on to departments as an information item via the Executive Committee of the Senate.

2 Subcommittee Memberships, 2001-02

REVISED Subcommittee Membership, 2001-02

3 Revised Honors Program Policies for 2001-02 and 2002-03; Effective Immediately

BEC 3 Amendments to CIC 3

Comment: CIC completed the work begun by its 2000-1 iteration. CIC’s goal was to make viable this clearly moribund program. Admission standards to the program were slightly lowered, and a number of the program requirements were weakened. Many of these changes were made in order to make the program manageable for transfer students who typically have two years (or less) to complete the program. The committee also recommended a series of “perks” to provide more incentive for students to enter the program. The revised program was approved by the Senate in the Fall of 2001.

4 Applications of THEA 2051 to G.E. Area C1 Humanities, Technology and Culture Cluster; Effective Spring 2002 and MUS 1000 to Area C1 Humanities, Holocaust & the Problems of Evil Cluster; Effective for Winter 2002 only.

5 Course Substitutions: MUS 2130 for MUS 1006 in the American Pop Culture cluster and GEOL 2100 for GEOL 2101 in the Aspects of Energy Natural Science cluster; Effective Fall Quarter 2001

6 BIOL 4025 to G.E. Areas B2 and B5, MLL 1221-32 to G.E. Areas C1-3, MLL 1611 to G.E. Area C2, MLL 2221-32 to G.E. Areas C1-3, and MLL 3611 to G.E. Area C1 under the 96/98 pattern; Effective Fall Quarter, 2001
7 PHIL 3711 to G.E. Area C4 for the 96/98 and 98/02 patterns; Effective Fall Quarter, 2001

8 POSC 3419 to G.E. Area D4 for the 98/02 pattern; Effective Fall Quarter, 2001

9 ES 3175 and ES 3180 to G.E. Area D4 for the 98/02 pattern; Effective Fall Quarter, 2001

10 ES 3430 to G.E. Area C4 for the 98/02 pattern; Effective Fall Quarter, 2001

11 PHIL 3153 to G.E. Area C4 and Area E for the 96/98 and 98/02 patterns; Effective Fall Quarter, 2001

12 ES 3175 and ES 3430 to the Cultural Groups/Women G.E. Requirement for the 1998/02 Pattern; Effective Fall Quarter, 2001

13 ES 3820 to the Area C4 and the Cultural Groups/Women G.E. Requirement for the 1996/98 and 1998/02 Patterns; Effective Fall Quarter, 2001

14 Reintroduction of Directed Group Study (DGS) Courses
   --Returned to CIC with a request for the proposed policy (replaced with CIC 24 below)

Comment: In response to the tragic events of the September 11, 2001, a number of departments offered specific courses tailored to subjects such as terrorism and just war. However, many departments were forced to shoehorn these “topics” courses into pre-existing courses that did not always match the subject matter particularly well. CIC recommended the development of open topic courses that could be offered by a department on an experimental basis, without going through the usual approval process. The Executive Committee had concerns that the old DGS program led to an unmanageable proliferation of topic courses. There were also concerns that the DGS courses essentially bypassed faculty governance. The recommendation was referred back to CIC for further consideration (see CIC 24).

15 Use of Grade Ranges to Determine Designation of Honors at Graduation and that a student’s grade range would be determined by their catalog of record.
   The grade range approach would replace the percentage approach of 1997-98 CIC 16.

Comment: Given the dangers of grade inflation, the academic senate acted in 1997-98 to preserve the significance of honors by adopting a percentage model for the determination of honors at graduation. However, there was some confusion as to how the percentage model should be implemented. The University catalogue and parts of 97-98 CIC 16 indicate that CIC would periodically review the G.P.A.’s earning honors and adjust them to assure that only the top 1% of CSUH
students graduate summa cum laude, the top 3% graduate magna cum laude and the top 8% graduate cum laude. On this “G.P.A.” reading, students could look to the catalogue for the actual G.P.A. necessary for honors, while CIC would periodically adjust those G.P.A.’s.

However, parts of 97-98 CIC 16 indicate that the honors standard is entirely based on the percentage rank upon graduation. On this “percentage” reading, the G.P.A. in the catalogue is merely a helpful benchmark, it is not the absolute standard for honors.

CIC moved to clarify this ambiguity and sided with the “G.P.A.” reading of the policy.

BEC 7 Amendments to CIC 15

16 Learning Outcomes for Lower Division GE in Science
--Returned to CIC with a request to work with the School of Science to clarify how the outcomes would be used in the GE process.

Comment: An important part of the continuing General Education program is the development of standards that can serve as criteria for determining the kinds of courses that count as foundational knowledge, as well as the development of learning goals, outcomes and indicators that can be used to assess the effectiveness of the G.E. Program. The school of science developed a series of Learning Outcomes that the school believed captured the essence of foundational knowledge in the natural sciences. CIC approved the outcomes; however, the Executive Committee had a number of concerns. Some members felt the outcomes were too vague to serve as adequate criteria in the curricular review process. Other members were concerned that it was unclear if these outcomes were to serve as assessment standards, criteria for curricular review, or both. The Executive Committee referred the matter back to CIC, which referred the matter back to the G.E. Subcommittee.

17 ANTH 3400 and ANTH 3430 to G.E. Area D4 for the 1998/03 G.E. Pattern; Effective Fall Quarter, 2001
--Returned to CIC with a request for the proper application format.
17 REVISED—now includes proper application format.

18 PSYC 1001 in the Individual and Society, Area D-Social Sciences cluster; PSYC 2004 in the Aspects of Energy, Area B-Natural Sciences cluster; and PSYC 2009 in the Science in the 21st Century, Area B-Natural Sciences cluster as a replacement for PSYC 1000; Effective Fall Quarter, 2002

19 Nomination of Dr. Debora Hammond as independent, external reviewer of the General Education Program
--Returned to CIC for further consideration (replaced with CIC 23 below)
Comment: At the end of the Fall Quarter, 2002, CIC was charged with the review of the General Education Program. Part of this review consisted of an independent, external review of the program. CIC selected Debora Hammond from Sonoma State University as the external reviewer. The Executive Committee had a number of concerns however. Dr. Hammond was only an Assistant Professor and was thus somewhat inexperienced for such a major review. The Executive Committee also had concerns that the selection process had not cast a wide enough net and had not considered many candidates. The matter was referred back to CIC for further consideration (see CIC 23).

20 ANTH 3520 and ANTH 3750 to G.E. Area D4 for the 1998/02 GE Pattern and ANTH 3790 to GE Area D4 for the 1996/98 and 1998/02 GE Patterns; Effective Fall Quarter, 2001

21 Nominations to the CIC Special Subcommittee on “On-line Instruction”

Comment: CIC established a special subcommittee to begin examining a number of issues that surround the use of on-line and web assisted education on campus.

22 Extension of the Current General Education Program Through the 2002-03 Academic Year

Comment: The extensive nature of the General Education Review made it unlikely that CIC would complete its work by the end of the 2002-3 Academic Year. This required extending the current program for at least one more year while CIC completes its work in the Fall of 2003.

23 Nomination of Jackie Donath as the Independent, External Reviewer of the General Education Program.

Comment: Working with Sally Murphy, Michael Strait and Carl Belone, CIC garnered a number of interested candidates for the independent external reviewer of the General Education Program. Debora Hammond, CIC’s original choice, was still a strong candidate (she was ultimately CIC’s second choice), but CIC selected Jackie Donath from Sacramento State University. Dr. Donath had a great deal of experience in directing a G.E. program and had performed program reviews on other campuses.


Comment: CIC took in the concerns of the Executive Committee regarding CIC 14 (DGS Courses) and recrafted a policy that gave departments open topics courses that could be used in a way similar to the old DGS courses.
BEC 8  Amendments to CIC 24

25  Policy on Cooperative Education for International Students
   --Returned to CIC for further consideration

REVISED Policy on Paid Co-op Ed, Internship and Supervised Fieldwork
Courses for International Students on F-1 Visas

Comment: Cooperative Education allows students to essentially work on the job
for a certain amount of university credits. No program at the University allows
students an unlimited number of such “courses” to count towards their degree.
However, programs do not limit the number of such courses that a student may
take either. The result was a loophole that essentially allowed students on a F1
Student Visa to take an unlimited number of Cooperative Education courses—thus
turning their F1 Student Visa into a de facto work visa. CIC recommended
limiting the number of such courses that a student on an F1 visa could take.

26  New Course and Course Modification Request Forms
   --Returned to CIC for further consideration

Comment: CIC proposed an updated “New Course” and “Course Modification”
Forms. The new forms would ask departments for information regarding
resources, assessment, delivery (online, long distance) as well as information
helpful for Degreeworks. The Executive Committee had numerous concerns. The
new forms seemed to increase the burden of designing courses, which seemed to
violate the “make it simple” policy that the Senate had adopted some years earlier
when it came to curricular innovation. There was also concern that the forms
would make CIC the “assessment police.” Finally, it was pointed out that Chairs
often do not have resource or even delivery information at hand before a course is
actually offered. The matter was referred back to CIC.

27  PHIL 3010 to G.E. Area A3 for the 1996/98 and 1998/02 G.E. Patterns;
   Effective Spring Quarter, 2002

28  ANTH 3545, 3550, and 3730 to Area D4 for the 1998/02 G.E. Pattern

29  Modification of the University Writing Skills Requirement (UWSR)

30  New Joint Ed.D in Urban Educational Leadership

CAPR 6  UC/CSU Joint-Doctorate of Education (Ed.D.)

Comment: This exciting program combines the efforts of CSUH, San Jose State
University and the University of California, Berkeley into a joint doctorate of
education—a first for the CSU.
31 MLL 3611 to G.E. Area C4 for the 1998/03 G.E. Pattern; Effective Fall Quarter, 2002

32 HIST 1017 as a replacement for HIST 1014 in the Ancient World, Humanities cluster; HIST 2018 as a replacement for HIST 1015; and HIST 2019 as a replacement for HIST 1016 in the Global Wealth, Poverty, and Inequality, Social Sciences cluster; Effective Fall Quarter, 2002

33 Removal of ENGL 3003 from Area C2 in the 1988/96, 1996/98, and Transfer G.E. Patterns and Area C4 in the 1996/98 and 1998/03 G.E. Patterns; Effective Fall Quarter, 2002

34 New Options in Actuarial Statistics, Biostatistics, Computational Statistics, and Mathematical Statistics; Effective Fall Quarter, 2003

35 Retention of Infrequently Offered Courses

36 New Master’s of Social Work (MSW) Degree; Effective Fall Quarter, 2003

Comment: Another exciting program that expands the reach of CSUH into applied areas that clearly, for social reasons, need to be addressed.

37 ANTH 3260 to Area D4 for the 1998/03 GE Pattern; MLL 3831 to Area C4 for the 1998/03 GE Pattern; PHIL 3325 to Area C4 for the 1996/98 and 1998/03 GE Patterns; Effective Fall Quarter, 2002

38 HIST 2018, MUS 2018, and PHIL 2040 to the New GE Area C, Humanities, Cluster, Cultures in Contact in the Medieval and Early Modern World; Effective Fall Quarter, 2002

39 New Options in Urban Teacher Leadership, M.S. in Education and M.S. in Educational Leadership

40 New Options in General Economics and Economics for Teachers, M.A. in Economics

41 New Options in General Economics and Accounting, B.A. in Economics

42 Discontinuance of the Option in Austrian Economics, M.A. in Economics

CAPR 9 Discontinuance of the Austrian Economics Option in the Masters in Economics Program
III. Continuing Items for 2002-3

The extensive review of the General Education program made it impossible for CIC to complete all of the items it addressed in the 2001-2 Academic Year. Specifically, there were six items raised at various meetings that the committee could not complete. They are:

1. Service Learning
2. New Course Forms
3. On Line Instruction
4. Academic Standards
5. Learning Goals for G.E.
6. General Education Review
1. Service Learning

CIC was charged to develop a policy on service learning on campus. This initiative was in response to the Governor’s call for voluntarism on campus and the Trustees’ mandate that service would be an “expectation” of graduation. CSUH has attempted to stimulate the development of service learning on campus by appointing a service learning director and an ad hoc committee on service learning. Furthermore, funds have been made available from the Chancellor’s office to support the development of service learning courses.

CIC appointed a special subcommittee that developed a working campus definition of service learning. However, the subcommittee did not develop any campus wide criteria or procedures for approval for service learning. After further discussions with the service learning director, there appeared to be a need for a uniform standard and procedure for review of service learning courses. There also appears to be a need to formalize the ad hoc service learning committee, perhaps by making it a subcommittee of CIC. At it’s last meeting of the year, CIC decided to refer a working draft on such procedures to 2002-3 iteration of the committee. This draft is included here.
California State University, Hayward

Draft Policy on Service Learning

Definition
Service Learning is a method under which students learn and develop through active participation in thoughtfully organized service that is conducted in and meets the needs of the community and is integrated into and enhances the core academic curriculum of students, through explicit learning objectives and preparation, providing structured time for students to reflect on and evaluate the service learning experience.

Requirements
All service learning courses must:

1. Service an identifiable community need
2. Serve an identifiable university, school and/or program curricular need
3. Link learning directly to the service component of the course
4. Utilize assignments that allow student to reflect on their service and its connection to the subject matter of the course.

Procedures for Approval
Application for service learning designation will be analogous to the applications for satisfaction of GE Requirements.

Proposed courses seeking a service learning designation should first be approved as courses via current school and university review policies. Once approved under such policies, new courses will be reviewed by CIC. Faculty proposing such courses will forward an “Application for Satisfaction of Service Learning Requirements” to the Committee on Instruction and Curriculum (CIC). CIC will review such applications in light of the above definition and requirements. Courses approved by CIC and the Academic Senate will be official “service learning” courses and will have an “S” designation in the class schedule and university catalogue.

Funding
Given available funding, Service Learning courses will receive support grants from the Service Learning Program. The grants will be allocated by the Service Learning Subcommittee, which consists of:

1. The service learning director
2. A presidential appointee
3. One member from each school
The Service Learning Sub-committee will be a subcommittee of CIC and, consistent with Senate policy, will be appointed by CIC upon approval of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.
2. New Course and Course Modification Forms

CIC proposed an updated “New Course” and “Course Modification” Forms. The new forms would ask departments for information regarding resources, assessment, delivery (online, long distance) as well as information helpful for Degreeworks. The Executive Committee had numerous concerns. The new forms seemed to increase the burden of designing courses, which seemed to violate the “make it simple” policy that the Senate had adopted some years earlier when it came to curricular innovation. There was also concern that the forms would make CIC the “assessment police.” Finally, it was pointed out that Chairs often do not have resource or delivery information at hand before a course is actually offered. The matter was referred back to CIC. CIC did not have time to address the issue again during the 2001-2 Academic Year. The original CIC document and a version of the modified form follows.
TO: Academic Senate
FROM: Committee on Instruction and Curriculum
SUBJECT: New Course and Course Modification Request Forms
PURPOSE: For Action by the Academic Senate

ACTION REQUESTED: That the Academic Senate approve the addition of the following items on the New Course Request form and the Course Modification Request form, effective Fall, 2002:

“Have the learning outcomes for this course been assessed by the department in light of the department’s learning goals.” _____Yes _____No

“DegreeWorks Information” (New Course form only)
   A. First Term and Year of Offering:
   B. Catalog Year of First Offering
   C. Majors permitting this Course as a Substitution:
   D. Effective Term this Course will be Allowed as a Substitution:
   E. Scribe as “Revealed” or “Hidden:”

“Resource Implications of the new course: (New Course Form Only)
   A. Number of sections planned per year
   B. Anticipated enrollment per section
   C. Funding source for additional sections

“Will this course be taught primarily on-line or through distance learning? If so, explain and indicate how many sections will be taught in this manner.”

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The New Course Request form and the Course Modification Request form predate the requirement for course learning outcomes and assessment, the DegreeWorks degree audit system, and varying forms of instruction. In addition, the resource implications question lacks specificity.

New Course and Course Modification Requests are primarily reviewed at the school level. However, GE related courses, courses in new degree proposals, and courses involving more than one school are reviewed by CIC and the Academic Senate. CIC
thought that everyone would benefit, including the schools, by revised New Course and Course Modification Requests that overcome some shortcomings in the current forms.

CIC discussed these shortcomings at meeting of March 18, 2002 and voted 9 to 0 to revise these forms by adding the above questions.

Since departments are required to have learning outcomes for their courses that fit with departmental learning goals, CIC thought it appropriate that a check for this information be added to new course requests and to course modification requests. However, CIC did not want to require that the learning goals be specified which would make them subject to centralized review. Rather CIC preferred that authority for the learning outcomes remain at the department level.

The Degree Works item will be added to the New Course Request form only. It is information that DegreeWorks programmers need to enter the course into the automated degree audit system.

CIC thought that it would be useful to know if a course was primarily designed or modified to be an online or distance learning course. At present, committees reviewing courses have no idea of they are reviewing a course that will primarily be offered in an alternative delivery mode.

The current “Resource Implications” question frequently get answered as “none,” which does not provide much useful information to the school office, school curriculum committee, or other committees. The addition of the above sub questions will provide review committees with a better idea of the impact on resources for a new course. Funding source for additional sections could certainly be “normal departmental allocation,” but at least reviewers would get an idea if the course being proposed would be one section every two years, or multiple sections per quarter, and be provided with an estimate of course enrollment.

attachment
COURSE MODIFICATION REQUEST

1. **Department** (Name of department or program which will offer the course)

2. **Alphabetical Prefix** (all capitals): **Course Number:**
   - **Full Title** in Catalog:
   - **Abbreviated Title** in Course Inventory (maximum 17 spaces, all capitals):
   - **Unit Value** of course:

3. **Type of Change**:

4. **Existing** prefix, number, titles, catalog description, classification number, and/or units, **whichever will be changed**

5. **Proposed** prefix, number, title, catalog description, classification number, and/or units, **whichever will be changed**

6. **Effective date** of modification:

7. **Effects**, if any, on **General Education-Breadth Requirement(s)** or **U.S. History-Institutions Requirement**.

8. **Will this course be taught primarily on-line or through distance learning?** If so, **explain and indicate how many sections will be taught in this manner**.
9. Have the learning outcomes for this course been assessed by the department in light of the department’s learning goals. _____ Yes _____ No

10. Justification for/Purpose of the Proposed Change including effects, if any, on Departmental Programs and students.

11. Resource Implications of the modification, if any.

12. Consultation with other affected departments and program committees, if any:
   a) The following department(s) has (have) been consulted and have no objections:
   b) The following department(s) has (have) been consulted and raise concerns:

       Department:
       Concern:

13. Certification of Department Approval by the chair and faculty.

       Chair: ________________________________ Date: __________________

14. Certification of School Approval by the dean and faculty review body and of Review by Associate Vice Presidents, Academic Programs and Graduate Studies and Academic Resources and Administration.

       School Curriculum Committee Chair: __________________________ Date: ______________

       Dean/Associate Dean: __________________________ Date: ______________
3. The Online Instruction Committee

With the electronic “blackboard” a part of every course at CSUH, the role of technology in education is a pressing issue for every instructor. Some members of CIC pointed out that the blackboard was selected and implemented with little faculty input and even less faculty governance. These members argued that the increasing use of technology on campus raised a number of fundamental issues that were by and large being ignored by faculty governance. These issues include:

- The cost of technologies such as blackboard and the appropriateness of such expenditures?
- The digital divide and what can be done about it?
- Accommodation for the disabled?
- Privacy rights for instructors and students who post material on the web?
- The appropriateness of various “delivery” methods given educational goals (i.e. G.E. requirements?)
- Does the use of online education change the nature of “academic honesty?”

To address these questions CIC established a special subcommittee for on line education. This committee met several times during the year and began deliberation on these issues. CIC voted at the end of the year to make the subcommittee a regular one. However, the committee was not able to determine the exact nature of this subcommittee. There was agreement, however, that the committee should address a broad range of issues regarding the relation of technology and instruction on campus. There was also broad agreement that the subcommittee should be charged with periodically reviewing online courses to determine if they meet appropriate university pedagogical requirements (again, courses that are to satisfy G.E. requirements is the most pertinent example).

The 2002-3 CIC will have to decide the exact charge of this subcommittee, as well as the exact nature of any procedure to be used in reviewing online or distance based education.
4. Academic Standards

In the Spring of 2002, CIC was charged with reviewing the implementation recommendations for the recent academic standards report. Key issues here include the setting of a maximum load students can take and a minimum G.P.A. requirement for students who wish to “overload.”

CIC was, by and large, unable to address this issue.

5. G.E. Standards/ Learning Outcomes

An important part of the continuing General Education program is the development of standards that can serve as criteria for determining the kinds of courses that count as foundational knowledge, and the development of learning goals, outcomes and indicators that can be used to assess the effectiveness of the program. The school of science developed a series of Learning Outcomes that the school believed captured the essence of foundational knowledge in the natural sciences. CIC approved the outcomes; however, the Executive Committee had a number of concerns. Some members felt the outcomes were far too vague to serve as adequate criteria in the curricular review process. Other members had concerns that it was unclear if these outcomes were to serve as assessment standards, criteria for curricular review, or both. The Executive Committee referred the matter back to CIC, which referred the matter back to the G.E. Subcommittee.

The 2002-3 iteration of CIC will have to determine if such standards are to be used as a criteria for the review of courses and/or clusters that purport to fulfill G.E. requirements, as learning outcomes to be used in evaluating the G.E. program, or both. CIC should keep in mind that similar outcomes for the humanities and social sciences are also being developed.

6. The General Education Review

See my separate report.

Special Thanks

Thanks to Connie Sexauer, Susan Correia, Rossane Moore and Carl Bellone for their assistance during the 2001-2 Academic Year. Their work goes a long way in the smooth functioning of CIC. Thanks to Sally Murphy for her work on the GE subcommittee (and other subcommittees as well). Thanks to Allison Warriner for her work on the writing skills subcommittee. Of course, thanks to all those who served on CIC’s various subcommittees—especially the GE Subcommittee, which did quite a bit of work this year. Finally, a special thanks to the other CIC members. The committee met very
frequently and produced numerous documents—all while carrying out an extensive review of GE. Thanks.

Dr. Terrence M. Kelly
Chairperson, CIC