

ICC Minutes for Tuesday February 7, 2017
NHE 113
9:00 a.m.

ICC Members

AMP: Rock Braithwaite, ~~Sara Hart~~, Sarah Fay Philips, Mary Glenn, David Greene, ~~Kris Patzlaff~~, ~~Chris Hopper~~, Rick Zechman, Dale Oliver, ~~Carl Hansen~~

CDC: Jodie Slack, Gregg Gold, Bruce O’Gara, Anne Paulet, Jenni Robinson, Sheila Alicea

GEAR: Chris Harmon

APC: Mary Virnoche

Student(s): Tina Lopez

Minutes-taker: Deema Hindawi

Guests: none

<p>1. Call for additions to the agenda</p>	<p>1. Call for additions to the agenda</p> <p>16-052: PSYC 304, Business Psychology, a new course to be cross-listed with BA 304. 3 units of lecture (C-4) with the following description:</p> <p>"Critically examine the psychological foundation of business by looking at how business agents think, feel and act in various situations and how managers make decisions."</p> <p>The course will meet UD GE Area D and will fulfill requirements for the Psychology major as a prescriptive elective. Its counterpart (BA 304) will be incorporated into the Business Admin major and minor.</p> <p>Approved</p> <p>16-095: BA 304, Business Psychology, new course to be cross-listed with PSYC 304. 3 units of lecture (C-4) with the following description:</p> <p>"Critically examine the psychological foundation of business by looking at how business agents think, feel and act in various situations and how managers make decisions."</p> <p>The course will meet UD GE Area D and will fulfill requirements for the Business major and minor programs. Its counterpart (PSYC 304) will be incorporated into the PSYC major as a prescriptive elective (choose x from this list).</p> <p>Approved</p> <p>16-100: Business Administration Program Change - Two changes. Add new course, BA 304, Business Psychology (16-095) to Electives.</p>
---	--

	<p>Move BA 120 (Business Essentials) from Core to Electives because it was intended for first time freshmen only. This change reduces the total units required by 1, allowing for a bit more flexibility.</p> <p>Recommend approve/Jodie</p> <p>Approved</p>
2. Approval of Minutes	<p>2. Approval of Minutes</p> <p>- Approval of the notes from December 24, 2017</p>
3. Reports from the chairs of CDC, APC, GEAR, and AMP	<p>3. Reports from the chairs of CDC, APC, GEAR, and AMP</p> <p>Updates of each program. We had a follow up about elearning and were told about upcoming GEAR meeting, in which an innovation was extended.</p>
4. Consent Calendar No items at this time.	4. Consent Calendar
<p>5. CDC Curriculum Proposals</p> <p>MUS 238 Studio Composition NEW COURSE PROPOSAL</p> <p>PROPOSAL#16-110 S-1, 1-unit individual instruction in composition. Upper division lessons are longer and for more advanced students. It would be offered every semester and will address issues for transfer students who are unprepared for the "audition" for the composition concentration and cannot take upper divisions until they pass it. Since this course will be allowed to substitute for one of the 4 sections of UD composition (MUS 438), it will allow transfers to move forward and graduate in two years. . RECOMMENDATION: Approve (Anne)</p> <p>PROPOSAL#16-108 Music Program Change: Composition Concentration The present requirement is to take MUS 438: Studio Composition, Advanced four times. Instead the department wants to add the option, with advisor approval, to substitute an additional</p>	<p>5. CDC Curriculum Proposals</p> <p>- Approved</p> <p>- Approved</p>

<p>semester of MUS 324: Contemporary Composition Techniques OR MUS 238: Studio Composition for one of the semesters of MUS 438. This will help address the issue that some transfer students are unprepared for the "audition" for the concentration and this slows their graduation since they cannot take upper division classes until they pass the "audition." (16-108)</p> <p>PROPOSAL#16-109 In 16-109 MUS 320C: Composition Electronic Music will be reactivated (this was on the first agenda as an consent item) RECOMMENDATION: Approve (Anne)</p>	
<p>6. Discussion Items</p> <p>a) Feedback to the LSEE program faculty</p> <p>In its January 24, 2017 meeting, the University Senate voted overwhelmingly against the ICC's recommendation of the proposed LSEE curriculum revision.</p> <p>What Feedback should/could the ICC provide to the University Senate? What advice should/could the ICC provide to the School of Education? What processes should/could the ICC undertake when proposing a controversial curricular change?</p> <p>b) Double-counting both American Institutions courses in Area D GE (speaking of controversial curricular change)</p> <p>Last meeting it was mentioned that our meeting discussions would include some of the items that have bubbled up from our December 8, 2016 Student Success Summit. The first issue to do so is our campus practice regarding American Institutions.</p> <p>According to HSU's Registrar, most of our sister CSU campuses allow both American Institutions requirements to count for Area D GE requirements. At HSU, we allow double counting for transfer students and for ERE majors. Is it time for HSU to allow double-counting of both American Institutions courses for Area D?</p> <p>Below is the resolution from the University Curriculum Committee that became the policy that we currently follow for all students other than transfers and ERE majors:</p>	<p>6. Discussion Items</p> <p>a) Bias was existent at the senate due to the fact that we hadn't seen opinions from the other side. The senate consisted of a one-sided opinion, leaving out others who were supporting the recommendations proposed. There is an importance of fieldwork that many people don't understand. People have focused on the content that will not actually prepare teachers to handle students. Some students have had bad fieldwork experiences that has made content even more important to them.</p> <p>b) They are slowly getting ready to move forward with their plans. This would just be about a three unit difference, which wouldn't make a great difference in graduation rates. This sparked a discussion on graduation rates and the importance of graduating in four years. It cost more money as well as time to graduate in more time than needed. With a major like history knowledge is important, being able to do several jobs. While with a major in the sciences, it is important to have a more narrow major, when doing certain jobs.</p>

(#02-04/05-EP)

Resolution on UCC Recommendation to Double Count Institutions

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Humboldt State University accept the recommendation of the University Curriculum Committee that one course satisfying the Title 5 Section 40404 / EO 405 American Institutions requirement be automatically double-counted towards Area D General Education requirements for all students, beginning AY 05/06.

RATIONALE: Section 40404 of Title 5 of the California Administrative code requires that each campus “shall provide for comprehensive study of American history and American government, including the historical development of American institutions and ideals, the Constitution of the United States and the operation of representative democratic government under that Constitution, and the processes of state and local government.” This regulation was implemented in the CSU by EO 405 on November 15, 1982.

In academic year 1999–2000 the University Curriculum Committee at Humboldt State University formed a General Education Structure Review Subcommittee with the charge of reviewing and improving the General Education Program at Humboldt State University. That committee recommended that Humboldt State University students be allowed to double count one institutions course in satisfying the General Education Area D requirements. The justifications for this proposal are:

1. Most transfer students already have double-counted Institutions and Area D, since this is a universal policy among California Community Colleges. It would be more equitable if native students also were able to double-count.
2. Not allowing native HSU students to double count Institutions courses will have the effect of driving these students to College of the Redwoods to fulfill their Institutions requirements.
3. By not allowing double-counting, we are requiring native HSU students to take five lower division social sciences courses (Area D and Institutions), compared to only three Humanities (Area C) and three Science (Area B) courses.
4. A pedagogical argument in favor of double counting is that freeing up three units so that a student may take either another class in his/her major, or an elective of his/her choice, is more beneficial to their education than requiring them to take an extra Area D GE class. (Even with double-counting of one Institutions course, native students

will still be required to take four lower division social science courses, one more than is required in Humanities Area C or Science Area B.)
5. In addition to being universal in the CCC, nearly half of the CSU campuses double count.
6. EO 595, "General Education Breadth Requirements" specifically permits double counting of Institutions for Area D.
7. Double-counting would allow students enhanced flexibility to take courses which interest them and facilitate timely graduation.

c) Promoting Best Practices in Curricular Reform. As our campus works toward the goals of GI2025, we will also discuss how the ICC can promote other best practices. Two meetings from now the Math Department will be proposing curricular changes that allow for the beginning of corequisite math remediation. Are there other practices that the ICC could/should promote in its work? See <http://completecollege.org/> if you have interest in reading about some of the systematic reforms that are improving graduation rates.

c) Students should graduate faster and closer to the 120 units in four years rather than more, to get into the world earlier with less debt and for more experience.

DRAFT