CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM

AMENDED Minutes of the Meeting of January 6, 2014

Present: Andrew Carlos, Jennifer Eagan (Acting Chair), Cristian Gaedicke, Yi He, Danika LeDuc (Secretary), Jim Mitchell, Susan Opp, Nancy Thompson, Michelle Xiong

Absent: Brian Cook, Thomas Duffy, Barbara Hall, Keith Kravitz, James Murray

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

1. Approval of Jennifer Eagan as Acting Chair
   M/S/P (Opp/Mitchell)
   Passed unanimously

2. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P (Opp/Mitchell)
   Opp asked to add an agenda item – a request to offer 3 World Civilization courses for online GE approval.
   Passed unanimously.

3. Approval of the minutes of December 2, 2013
   M/S/P (Mitchell, Gaedicke)
   Opp: New Business A – 2) Civil Engineering will soon be proposed.
   Passed unanimously.

4. Report of the Chair
   James Murray (Chair) is at conference. Eagan has nothing to report.

5. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   Nothing to report.

6. Old Business:
   a. School of Engineering proposal
      i. Draft CIC document
         Watnik: CIC previously approved the proposal for forming a School of Engineering. The document was revised to include language of how the school director would be appointed and implications for RTP. Eagan asked if those were issues for FAC. Watnik explained that FAC thinks these should be specified in the original proposal for forming the school.
         A motion was made to send the document with revisions to Senate.
         M/S/P (Opp/He)
         Opp asked which vote count should be on the document.

Branstad said that a note and the date can be added to the bottom about changes in the Background information.
Vote count: 8 yes, 1 abstention

6. New Business

    a. Referral on Procedures for Proposing Schools
      i. 13-14 FAC 4
    Eagan was unsure about what action we would take on this at this point. Opp requested that we simultaneously consider examining the CAPR document on the Formation, Dissolution, Merger, or Name Change of Academic units. CIC should have an analogous document. The CAPR document has inaccuracies about procedures that need to be corrected. The problem is larger than just this issue. Watnik said that he would be able to expand the charge to include this. Opp agreed that it needs to be expanded. This document is covering many different procedures that are not equivalent in their implications. Eagan said this fits into CIC because of implications to catalog, website, and prefixes. Opp envisions a behind-the-scenes working group with members from CAPR, CIC, and FAC. Eagan suggested that ExCom expand and clarify the charge.

    b. Checking for prerequisites
    Opp asked to have this put on agenda. Document (12-13 CIC 8) amended on the Senate floor has an action requested at beginning that does not match action requested at end as well as some conflicting items in between. Final action requested is: "that prerequisite coursework shall be required and a list of students who don't meet the prerequisite will be sent to the instructor through PeopleSoft during the enrollment process for all courses starting during enrollment for the Fall 2014 quarter courses." In light of this, APGS asked all programs to review prerequisites, giving a July 1, 2013 deadline for inclusion in the 2014 catalog. Many departments did not modify prerequisites for any courses. Problematically, many courses have prerequisites listed that can't be checked through PeopleSoft – e.g. requirement for a previous statistics course (which is a problem for transfer students who may have taken a qualifying class with a MATH prefix) or "skill in computer usage." Other problems include complicated lists, requirements for particular status (e.g. graduating senior), particular grades, "either/ors", or vagaries, (e.g. lower division quantitative reasoning.) As such, all prerequisites have to be examined. The Fall quarter schedule is put into PeopleSoft in March. So, revisions would have to be done before March for the planned Fall implementation. This is not going to happen. The best-case scenario would be implementation in Winter 2015.
    Opp sent a query to AVP academic planners throughout CSU regarding how/if they enforce course prerequisites using Peoplesoft and what policies may be listed. There was quite a bit of variation. Channel Islands uses only course numbers. Bakersfield does whatever is enforceable. Others leave it up to departments. Transfer students will be a problem. The bottom line is that

there is quite a bit more work that needs to be done and clarification as to what is possible. Departments will need to go through all prerequisites. Eagan asked if it is easy to code by course number. Opp said that the problem is students transfer with different course numbers. It is also not clear what faculty members are expected to do with the list. Eagan said that there had been discussion on the Senate floor about what people would do. Carlos asked isn't the point of Assist to say what courses are equivalent. Opp agreed but pointed out that data cannot be pulled directly from Assist. LeDuc asked about the problem of students not having yet passed course when enrolling for the next one. He commented that faculty members are still quite lost and need guidance as to the wording of prerequisites that will work. Perry said that in his analysis of prerequisites many are vague. PeopleSoft only considers the prerequisite met if it is met at that moment, so if course is restricted to juniors or seniors, rising sophomores will be blocked. It could be set up so that if a course has not yet been completed, students could enroll for the next one in the sequence. The Senate memo has no discussion of frequency of generating lists. In order to provide the lists, all prerequisites must be temporarily turned off. Eagan said that the faculty will use these lists to talk to students and weed out those who don't belong. She also commented that even a prerequisite that is "unenforceable" on PeopleSoft may be meaningful to those students for whom it is relevant. Perry mentioned that some departments have "suggested prerequisites." Watnik made two points: 1) If the list is issued right before classes begin, it is not being used for blocking registration; 2) Curriculum committee at another institution banned use of "consent of instructor" since this is implied, unless it is the only prerequisite. Perry raised a concern about consistency of how prerequisites and such lists would be used across the University, similar to the problems with how waitlists are handled. Mitchell asked if there was a CBA issue with "consent of instructor", such as adding over cap. Eagan said that if the computer blocks a student out of a class, the instructor has the right to grant a permission number, even if it is above cap. Mitchell asked if that is a guaranteed right. Opp replied yes, as long as the enrollment does not exceed the capacity of the physical space per the fire marshal. Opp was concerned about the timing of generating the lists. If run just before classes start, prior quarter's grades can be included. On the other hand, this timing may not be the most humane for students with implications for financial aid, schedule, etc…When is the best time to find out? Eagan asked what should be the committee's course of action, to revise policy? Opp suggested we modify this policy to say what it is that Peoplesoft will check for (particular course numbers) and that prerequisite checking will be limited to course numbers and student standing. Perry advised looking for aberrations that exist now. Eagan asked that we have an informational piece from PEM about what is possible to check in advance of revising CIC 8. Opp said that Fresno's policy is probably closest to what we could do easily – only course and level prerequisites (class standing, admission to program, major in particular program) – maybe not grades, need to change the dates.

LeDuc asked what counts as meeting prerequisite. Perry said that the default is a "D" in the course. Opp reiterated that we need a list of what is not enforceable. The discussion concluded with an agreement that Perry would produce a document that outlines what Peoplesoft can and cannot do with respect to prerequisites so that faculty have the option to create ones that will work. This will be done before the policy is modified. Eagan said we will revisit at next meeting.

c. Need for curriculum planning software
Opp began that there are many curricular processes going through CIC or CAPR that can be confusing. They have produced flow charts of levels of approvals, and it is very complicated. There are software packages that could be used to automatically track proposals, put them on appropriate agendas, and once approved, put them into catalog. Currently, Aubert has to enter information separately into catalog and Peoplesoft. Eagan asked would it actually work. Some software systems don't work as well as promised. Also, how much does it cost? If faculty will interface with the software, will they have input? Opp answered that they are not that far yet. Other CSUs have such systems. Perry said that things would move faster if there was a campus mandate behind it. Mitchell warned that careful consideration is necessary. Guo said he is a strong advocate for such software and a clear process for documents. Currently, there is a great deal of behind the scenes work and too much reliance on people's memories and email. Eagan agreed the way we do things now is not good, but the question remains what will be done to fix it and what the best kind of system is. To get faculty support, more details will be needed. Opp explained that how the process works is that the University would put out a request for proposals with the required capabilities of the software. Bids will be made from different companies. Then, we can look at their products. We are not allowed to start inviting presentations first. Eagan asked if can invite sister campuses to look at what they have. Opp said this could be a possibility. M/S (He/Mitchell) – to explore this for next meeting. Passed unanimously. APGS will bring more information to next meeting.

d. Area D certification for ECON 2301 and 2302
   i. Email chain with additional information
   Murphy explained that the academic senate voted that GE outcomes must be listed on all courses with GE approval. This request has been sent to instructors. The Chair of Economics (Jed De Varo) expressed concern that the faculty can meet these learning outcomes. When he surveyed the faculty, only one said that he can't meet all five requirements. He was replaced with another faculty member and assigned a different course. As such, immediate action is now moot. CBE has been particularly active in aligning GE and course outcomes for Academic Senate. Murphy is not sure with other colleges so perhaps more circumstances like this exist. Problems arise in part because of faculty turnover. An education process needs to be undertaken. Gaedicke is puzzled how courses could have outcomes that the faculty don't know about. Murphy explained that it is the responsibility of department chairs to

inform instructors, and that some may be new. Gaedicke offered a training session from Faculty Development might be in order. Murphy said it is an institutional issue (i.e. not just faculty). Eagan explained that the previous administration had demonstrable contempt for GE and that students don't understand why they need it. We should be explaining what a comprehensive college education is, the value of writing intensive courses, that clusters lead to freshmen success, and that GE is the clearest line to ILO's. Eagan commended de Varo for his action. Opp said that learning outcomes are required on all course syllabi. CBE should be commended for it. Guo explained that for most classes the learning outcomes from the instructor, who may not necessarily know the GE learning outcomes. He suggested an automated reminder of GE learning outcomes. Murphy asked who is going to do that. Eagan answered "good department chairs." Opp said it was possible to pull a report of every GE course and attach list of GE learning outcomes. Carlos asked how to find the outcomes (found on GE subcommittee website). Watnik suggested that degree program roadmaps should have recommendations for some GE, since it is part of the curriculum. CIC could actively encourage this. Opp said that Murphy has recommended this for years. Murphy explained that when learning communities were new, the Senate did not endorse GE recommendations because they thought it should be free choice. Opp explained that several majors have to take specific GEs as double counts or they can't get under 180 units. Eagan said that the GE subcommittee will work on encouraging faculty to put the GE outcomes on their syllabus and proposed a syllabus bank. Watnik agreed this would help new faculty.

   e. Online GE request for HIST 1014, 1015, 1016
   Opp explained that History 1014 is being taught right now and offered online as a GE. However, the GE subcommittee doesn't meet until next week. This is not how approvals for online/GE should be done. However, Linda Ivey didn't do this purposefully, and it is a Chancellor's office redesigned course. M/S/P (Opp/LeDuc)
   Provisional approval of courses HIST 1014, 1015, and 1016 pending approval by GE subcommittee.
   Passed unanimously.

7. From the floor
   Murphy wanted CIC to know what the GE subcommittee is doing. They were not able to meet in the Fall. They will be working on assessment of critical thinking as an institutional and GE outcomes, analyzing student work with faculty developed rubrics. This will affect the committee's ability to do other work.

8. Adjournment
   (3:50 p.m.)