

Integrated Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: Tuesday January 30, 2024

Time: 9:00am to 11:00 am

Place: NHE_102 or zoom: <https://humboldtstate.zoom.us/j/7078264143>

Members Preset

Jill Anderson, Cindy Bumgarner, Christine Cass, Amanda Dinscore, Sara Hart, Kristin Heese, Alison Hodges, Tasha Howe, Nicole Jean Hill, Lucy Kerhoulas, Heather Madar, Bori Mazzag, Justus Ortega, Marissa Ramsier, Jenni Robinson Reisinger, Mark Rizzardi, Joshua Smith, Melissa Tafoya, Anna Thaler, Lisa Tremain, Mark Wicklund, Jim Woglom,

ICC Chair: Jill Anderson

GEAR Chair: Marissa Ramsier

CDC Chair: Lucy Kerhoulas

APC Chair: Nicole Jean Hill

Curriculum and Catalog Specialist: Cameron Allison Govier

Administrative Coordinator: Andrea Bright

Members Absent: None

Time	Agenda Item	Notes
	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Approval of the minutes from the meeting of December 12, 20232. Gear Retreat 01/16/2024 Agenda & meeting minutes	<p>12/12 approved</p> <p>GEAR retreat Approved</p>

Time	Agenda Item	Notes
	1. Voting Action Calendar	No Items
	1. Program Review Introduction Peer Review Assignments (so far)	<p>Mark Wicklund:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Foundational Guidebook to peer reviews that anyone who is faculty on the Committee will be working on. 2. Steps <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Procedural Overview <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Background on why we do Peer Review ii. University Review process is 7 year cycle iii. Submitted to ICC iv. Faculty of ICC give a peer review v. Then an external reviewer interviews faculty and students, vi. The external Reviewers findings plus the peer review of the ICC all go the the Dean of that college vii. Which leads to an MOU with the Provost, Dean, and program. viii. Goes over all the Links to the Program Materials. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If you click on the link that you have been assigned it goes over the IRA data. b. Please Review <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. This goes over the Decorum and Tactful suggestions

Time	Agenda Item	Notes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Diplomatic feedback iii. Deadlines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Important Deadline for Philosophy Program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The external Reviewer is coming in early March 7 2024 and meeting with the Administrators. b. Due Date for peer reviews is 2/27/2024 because the external reviewer uses the peer review as feedback
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Universal Common Pathway Resolution? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● We do not have to do a campus resolution but we can. ● The informal poll for ASCSU feedback indicated 50/50 in support and not in support of the ASCSU resolution. ● ASCSU passed this resolution: AS-3666-23/EXEC/AA “OPPOSITION TO CHANGING CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY GENERAL EDUCATION BREADTH AT THIS TIME” ● Resolutions from other campuses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maritime ○ Fullerton ○ LA 	<p>Jill Anderson</p> <p>Main Topic of Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether or not to make the transfer pathway the General Education expectation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Common Terminology: “Native students”, which are students who start at the CSU and are not transferring in from community college. 2. ASUCSU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Spoke a lot to not necessarily opposing that GE requirements becoming the same for everyone but that they were no thrilled for the timeline for it b. More of a Data informed to the process 3. Does ICC feel that Humboldt should have a Campus resolution with consideration to the timeline of the BOT current actions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. There is not a consensus based on prior feedback.

Time	Agenda Item	Notes
	<p>Please note- sharing the above resolutions is not a suggestion we would have to agree with, just sharing what other campuses/ASCSU have done as examples.</p> <p>BOT meeting next Wednesday January 31st. At 10:30am, the Committee on Educational Policy will be covering an item on AB 928, "Proposed Amendments to Title 5: Implementation of the 4 Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act of 2021."</p> <p>This is likely going to be the time and space where the BOT will determine whether we will have a single-unified GE pattern or not, however the official vote on this decision will not happen until the March BOT meeting.</p>	<p>b. This may reflect the larger campus discussion</p> <p>4. Feedback</p> <p>a. What would be the point of the resolution?</p> <p>b. Timeline of the possibilities</p> <p>i. It is possible that Campuses can have different requirements, and different feelings about it across campus, and will Senate provide the space for the feedback</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Answer: Jim - SenEx has discussed this and the potentially the information item can be brought to Senate based on ICC 2. Answer: Jill - Campuses can theoretically preserve area E if they choose to do that and that could be part of the conversation if we expand the university requirements. <p>c. Reacting to the BOT timeline</p> <p>i. The campus communities are doing work that overlaps with one another and we need to have a discussion and a space about what kind of programming there should be. Campus placed based learning communities for example. Whether or not that type of learning should be a part of the GE and would impact the work and programming is occurring.</p> <p>d. Jill: Do we want to put out a statement about the BOT decision and timeline</p>

Time	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>e. Jill: Do we want to make any changes to the university level requirements</p> <p>f. Framing the conversation without causing a panic.</p> <p>i. Jenni - Agrees with getting together, (ICC and Senate) and having a much larger conversation, that does not cause panic but also takes into consideration the BOT upcoming meeting and decisions with a campus response. But it may or not be productive if we wait to long to have the conversation</p> <p>1. Jill: It may be a good idea to have the ICC have a larger conversation about it and then taking it to Senate after discussing it with ICC</p> <p>g. Does anyone have strong feelings about making campus resolutions, and how do we feel about the adoption of these universal standards?</p> <p>i. No feedback, Jill - ICC will not move forward with that, but everyone is welcome to watch the BOT meeting and we will review it.</p> <p>h. Will doing Arts classes be permitted and will the combining 1 GE classes be permitted, and should this be a campus conversation about these decisions, or will it get decided at a Higher level, and will affect many people's instruction?</p> <p>i. Carmen - that is not something that I have heard yet in that level of detail. It is unclear</p>

Time	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>about the 1 unit classes. During the revision those questions will be brought up and during the GEAR program review we can review that so it is clearly articulated. PBLC pieces will also need to be reviewed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Jenni - When the executive order is written I think that those conversations will happen, however that is something ASCSU may want to focus on however, they may or may not want to focus on CALGETSY requirements and focus on their own GE requirements, I think that all the curriculum review committees and bodies should probably start having these reviews and conversation so that the CALGETSY programs can have the best refined reviews of these requirements. i. Writing a Resolution for ICC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Anna - It may not be the most feasible thing to write our own resolution, because of the current feedback and 50/50 on our decision is showing that we are divided and unsure, more discussion maybe needed as well j. 50/50 response from ICC body <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Only sent to the ICC members. k. Rationale for the same pathway? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Jill - Feeling of equity for students, and making sure that all students are going down the same pathway when it comes to

Time	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>GE requirements and making sure the students can graduate at the same pace.</p> <p>ii. Carmen - I believe that the university has come to this issue before in the early 2000's, i will look further into that.</p> <p>I. Overview</p> <p>i. Jill -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discussion on Campus opinions 2. Potential resolution on CALGETSY details and implementation 3. How can we communicate those opinions? 4. Report out to the Senate about ICC 50/50 feedback
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MAPs feedback- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Consider rotations? b. How to make them less 'messy' and more useable 	<p>Main Discussion :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Camie: Rotations has come into discussion a couple of times, and looking at courses like stretch calculus and how that fits into the rotation. When we are working on the entry we are not always going to catch certain details like that and things like blendings and making sure that those are actually being offered. and we would like to know how to add more details to the MAPS resources page and if anyone has that kind of feedback please let us know.

Time	Agenda Item	Notes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Would it be useful for MAPS to prepopulate a DARS degree plan so that the student could then edit the Plan from the MAPS? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Jenni could answer that, because that department owns it. ii. Ann - There is a link to the MAPS on multiple pages. Prepopulation may cause some confusion and what they are adhering to and discussion with their advisor, and topics of moving forward with their degree. MAPS is an advising tool and maybe putting them together might pull the advising part out if it. iii. Bori - How we present and language could be different and know that MAPS and DARS are a way to complete it and not the only solution. We also could leave it generally open, and that may be nice, however the PBLC's is very specific and it may cause more coordination that may be needed between the two bodies. So that we can make a better distinction. Should we look at the schedule we are asking departments to review that because of their own timeline. A lot of curricular changes have made these MAPS outdated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Carmen: Curriculum is finding a lot of areas that need to be addressed, this is a process of researching and

Time	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>outreaching to every department about their MAPS which may also take a long time.</p> <p>iv. Heather - MAPS and course rotation, I agree with Jill's comment that it may be needed but not quick to complete. In inlight of PLBC's and MAPs, students were finding inconsistencies which caused some confusion, so that students could navigate them. I have also been hearing from a number of people in CAHSS about prospective GE listings on MAPs. Ethnic studies saw that CNRS had NAS for area F. This may be an issue for the different students' curriculum and this may be a bigger conversation.</p> <p>v. Jenni - Catalog duties are all in academic programs, but I do want to address that this is an ongoing issue trying to address this maintenance and advising issue, and historically we did send out updates annually requesting updates. As people submit program changes they also have to submit updated MAPS although that was always something that for some people on CDC can be a lot of work. Our messaging about MAPS, should be more communicated as a suggested pattern that is communicated with students that it is not</p>

Time	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>required. All CSU's will be updating their planner tools DAR and Highpoint and the Chancellors would like to work with everyone on how we are upgrading. New options coming ahead.</p> <p>vi. Josh - Chemistry has a lot of pathways that are all relying on prerequisites, and using a visual MAPS (Lucid map) is helpful. Moving things around and keeping track helps when it is more visual and can be suggested for people. As far as area F, we are making that more optional for students.</p> <p>2. If every student is supposed to theoretically be in a PBLC by this fall, it would seem that this would be a very good time if we get a MAPs overview completed to match the times.</p> <p>a. However not all PLBC's will be the same which may make some inconsistencies in the MAP's.</p> <p>b. Carmen: PBLC's will be a GE area and that will be discussed with students, so they can move forward with their progress and we did address this in the planning phase of this because we want to make sure the transition phase will match correctly and onboarding first year students.</p> <p>i. In coordinating this is still maybe difficult.</p> <p>3. Is it acceptable just say Lower division instead of specific areas</p>

Time	Agenda Item	Notes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Carmen: That is definitely something that we are looking into and being more flexible when the MAP's come into play. b. Camie: It would be difficult to tell what type of GE requirement is being met and making sure that is distinguishable is important for graduation requirements. I have looked at other campuses and seen how they MAP it however there is a variance in how to apply it and looking at the time it takes to MAP in each way is still large. <p>4. Justus: Course rotation should be an automatic trigger for curriculum updates. When it comes to the PLBC's, it is very complex, and looking at the block scheduling may be an automatic trigger for an MAP's update. These can be individualized. There needs to be some type of communication that needs to be worked with the advisor, so people can have a Major academic plan that is accurate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Lisa: I agree with Justus' point, and looking at the DARS planners.
	Amendment to the Agenda:	<p>Discussion from Carmen on Low Conferring degrees</p> <p>This has been discussed at the Welcome and may need to be indeed to a future agenda</p> <p>1. Steps in the overall process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provost has communicated it with the Campus

Time	Agenda Item	Notes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Collecting data c. Welcome back d. Provost asked that we discuss it with this body. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Senate agenda item from the Provost: Low Conferring degrees, <p>2. Most important questions are, what additional things need to happen and what additional feedback do you have? Does everyone feel like they have been able to provide their feedback?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. We really need a list of what came out of all of these things. b. Jenni - How detailed are the reviews? As we change curriculum over time that means we have students who are graduating under old and new majors, like international studies, there are numbers/data from them when they were in the interdisciplinary studies but now are elevated c. Carmen: Contributing feedback will become more inclusive for feedback and looking at the data for metrics that frame a concentration. <p>3. How and rather our Campus might look at the ways our programs will be specified in looking at the metrics, and how we are growing as a Cal Poly, and does this mirror the ways in which we are growing in enrollment for example philosophy, experienced a decline with the decline in enrollment and then we grew when enrollment grew.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Carmen: Short answer Yes, however there are about 8 low enrolled campuses and Humboldt is

Time	Agenda Item	Notes
		<p>one of them. However, if you take away those 8 and look at the 23 campuses like San Diego and Fullerton then Humboldt in comparison is on the list.</p> <p>4. However, if we see a program that is not mirroring enrollment and is still on the list, are we as a Campus going to put additional resources into that program, if so, what will that look like or are they ok where they are?</p> <p>5. Bori = has it been clarified yet who will be doing the work in reviewing these low degree conferring programs and where does the responsibilities lie on recruitment of them?</p> <p>a. Carmen - we are looking at those pieces, when it comes to recruitment. However, we haven't decided in OAAA leadership who will be doing the work in the review process, however we are still trying to welcome feedback on the process. but the process will need to be completed May 10, 2024</p>
	<p>1. Process for Blended Pathways-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Updating existing programs for policy b. Information we would want included above what CO requires c. Chancellor's Office Policy d. Cal Poly Humboldt Policy - approved last semester and is in the process of being uploaded to the Humboldt Policy page. 	<p>Was not addressed due to time.</p>

Time	Agenda Item	Notes
	e. Notes from discussions during AY 2022-23.	
	Next Up: Subcommittees- 2/6 Full ICC 2/13	

Voting Action Calendar