Members present: Jennifer Eagan, Bridget Ford, Jim Mitchell, Jim Murphy (Chair), Jim Murray, Sue Opp, Norman Smothers, Glen Taylor.

Members absent: Kyzyl Fenno-Smith, Evelia Jimenez, Claudia Uhde-Stone, vacant student seats

Guests: Jiansheng Guo, Rosanne Harris, Sally Murphy

1. Approval of Agenda
   M/S/P Mitchell/Taylor 7/0/0

2. Approval of Minutes of 11/15/2010
   M/S/P Taylor/Eagan 8/0/0

3. Report of CIC Chair
   No report.

4. Report of AVP APGS
   Dr. Opp reported that two proposed online programs, from Ethnic Studies and Women Studies, would be reaching the CIC committee fairly soon.

   The committee wishes Glen Perry well, and hopes for his speedy recovery.

5. Revisiting the Program Revision of Interdisciplinary Programs

   The proposed language for a revision of interdisciplinary degree programs will establish a policy for the use of lecturer faculty serving on students’ three-person faculty committees. Regular faculty will need to co-sign for lecturers’ service, and lecturer faculty members must sign waivers stating that their service on a student’s committee is voluntary and uncompensated. The minimum GPA for undergraduates to create a program of interdisciplinary study will increase from 2.30 to 2.50.

   These changes, as described in a formal “Request for Approval of Revision of the B.A./B.S./M.A./M.S. Degree Major in Interdisciplinary Studies,” will be posted on Sharepoint for a week for comment.

   M/S/P Eagan/Murray 8/0/0

6. Request from Director of General Education to examine the “passing D’ grade in ENGL 1002
Sally Murphy and Rosanne Harris are looking at second semester English requirements across the CSUs, and find that while CSU East Bay is among ten campuses that require a second composition course, it is the only university of the ten that allows a grade of “D” to clear the course.

ENGL 1001, by contrast, requires a C- or better to pass. Thus there is a disparity between CSU East Bay’s grade requirements for ENGL 1001 and 1002, as well as a disparity with other CSU campuses requirement the second composition course.

One problem stemming from this is that students receiving a “D” in ENGL 1002 might assume that they can pass the WST exam, but this is probably not the case.

A discussion ensued about whether a grade of “D” constituted a passing grade. The committee seemed to be of the feeling that we need higher expectations for such a critical skill as writing.

A question arose as to how many ENGL 1002 students have received “D” grades and passed out of the requirement. It is not known if the “D” grade is widely used among faculty in ENGL 1002, although some on the committee were interested to have a sense of the numbers here.

The committee discussed that parallelism between ENGL and 1001 and 1002 made logical sense. To even take ENGL 1002, a student must receive a grade of “C-” in ENGL 1001.

A member suggested that we consider a grading system of “A,” “B,” or “C” or No Credit, and eliminate the grade of “D.” Members suggested that students are less likely to challenge this system of grading, compared to a system of grading where a “D-” can be assigned.

Dr. Eagan believes that uniformity between ENGL 1001 and 1002 is important, and a good policy.

A question arose about jurisdiction: Can CIC make policy for the English Department with respect to grading of specific courses? Since the course is a graduation requirement, the issue has university-wide scope, and would change catalog. Hence, the change should also go before the Academic Senate.

Dr. Opp noted that a grading system of “A,” “B,” or “C” or No Credit counts toward the number of units a student can retake, and that an “NC” does not affect a student’s GPA.

Dr. Eagan believes the English faculty need to weigh in on this issue.

It was decided that Dr. Murphy should first speak with Drs. Dennis Chester and Margaret Tomlinson-Rustick of the English Department about this, and then come back to CIC to report.
A formal vote on any changes to current policies was not taken, although it appeared that the consensus of CIC is in favor of a change to the grade requirement for passage of ENGL 1002 to make it consistent with ENGL 1001, and thus more rigorous. Dr. Murphy may ask the Department of English to bring a formal curricular proposal to this effect.

A further discussion of whether a “D-” can constitute a passing grade ensued, without resolution.

7. Review of the Flowcharts provided by AVP Opp

Dr. Opp presented her office’s efforts to provide visual “flowcharts” of the steps necessary to obtain approvals for modifying existing degree programs and modifying existing degree programs to online format and for new degree programs as well as fast-track new degree programs. In her experience, faculty and administration have had difficulty visualizing the steps necessary to alter programs and gain approval for new programs.

She emphasized that the flowcharts in no way alter the process as outlined in the Curricular Policy Manual. The Provost would also like to see more oversight of the approvals process, and this would help faculty and administration understand that approval for new degree programs is a careful, multi-stage process.

Dr. Murphy observed that one can see an academic culture revealed in the flow charts, and that they could be very helpful for long-range planning. He asked whether they could be included in the Curricular Policy Manual.

It was again stressed that this was not a policy change of any kind, and more of an information item. There have been problems with the process for fast-track new degree program proposals, and as a university we want to ensure well-considered program proposals. The fast-track process has perhaps been used too often, leading to inadequate long-range planning.

Dr. Guo felt that the flow charts really represents policy, and that they are very educational, since the manual may not be read by many faculty thinking about new degree programs. He wondered if they could be used as routing forms to reinforce procedure.

Speaking from the perspective of a member of a department, though, Dr. Guo wondered about the length of time needed for approval of a new degree program, and wanted to know who determines what should be on the fast-track process. He is somewhat baffled by the long time it takes to create and see to approval a new degree program.

Dr. Opp emphasized that the “fast track” process is not necessarily faster than a normal approval process for new degree programs. Even the fast-track process can take 2 years, and the normal approval process might be three years. In other words, the difference in time is not four years (for the normal process) vs. one year (for the fast-track process). She sees the fast-track process as a more risky one, that can be rejected at the last step, with the Board of Trustees. The potential for disappointment is greater.
She emphasized “Stage 1” of the approvals process for a new degree program, which requires approval of the program proposal without curricular details, so that departments don’t have to work up all of the numerous small details before actually getting early stage-one approval. This stage-one of the process of approval ensures an initial higher level, long range look at the proposal. It asks the question, “Does this proposed program fit with the mission of the university?” It does not get into details of a program proposal, which should be elaborated later in the process.

Dr. Eagan believes that the flow charts should go to the Academic Senate as an information item. She believes that faculty need to see these. Dr. Taylor agreed that the flow charts are very helpful, especially with the logic of each stage explained in the right column. Sometimes the forms from the manual are a little hard to follow. But he wants to ensure that such terms as “modifying” are clear to faculty. And he wondered if each of the boxes listed on the flow charts could be a clickable link. This might be difficult.

A healthy discussion ensued about whether we are discouraging innovation, or helping to keep poor proposals from arising, as is the intent of the process overall.

Dr. Taylor wondered if decisions might be made at the college level based upon the onerous nature of the process for approval. For example, would a college consider creating an option rather than a new program, given the difficulty of gaining approval for a program? On the other hand, he felt that we do need to have institutional memory and to document the process carefully. Bottom line: the flow charts are very helpful, according to Dr. Taylor.

A discussion continued about dissemination of the flow charts. Could they go to the associate deans for dissemination? They will be an information item for ExCom. Could they be included in the orientation for department chairs? Or used by curricular committees at the college level? At a minimum, department chairs need to see these.

Dr. Opp will consult further on the charts, and will bring them back to CIC. She will plan to offer them to the associate deans and to the curricular committees of the colleges.

Another line of discussion involved including DCIE, and whether self-support programs would require a separate kind of flow-chart.

Dr. Guo said that he would give a couple of further small comments about the flow charts directly to Dr. Opp.

8. From the Floor
   No Comments.

9. Adjournment
   Norman/ Ford, 8/0/0
   Respectfully submitted,
   Bridget Ford