

ICC Meeting Agenda

Meeting Date: Tuesday September 19, 2023

9:00am to 10:50am

Hyflex:

NHE_106 or

<https://humboldtstate.zoom.us/j/7078264143>

ICC Members:

Julie Alderson (Interim Chair), Paul Michael Atienza, Cindy Bumgamer, Carmen Bustos-Works*, Christine Cass, Amanda Dinscore, Eden Donahue, William Fisher, Cameron Allison Govier, Sara Jaye Hart, Kristin Hesse, Heather Madar, Bori Mazzag, Cindy Moyer, Justus Ortega, Marissa Ramsier, Jenni Robinson Reisinger, Mark Rizzardi, Joshua Smith, Anna Thaler, Lisa Tremain, Melissa Tafoya, Mark Wicklund, Jim Woglom

GEAR Chair: Marissa Ramsier (Pro tem)

CDC Chair: Lucy Kerhoulas

APC Chair: Nicole Jean Hill

Student Representatives: Vacant

Administrative Coordinator: Julie Stewart

Curriculum and Catalog Specialist: Cameron Allison Govier

*Non-voting member

Time	Agenda Item	Action Items
9:00-9:05	1. Approval of the minutes from the meeting on September 5, 2023 a. Minutes are approved without objections	
9:05-9:20	2. Subcommittee Reports i. CDC 1. CDC is having a working session (over 200 proposals!). Will be meeting just their group for the foreseeable future to get through the proposals ii. GEAR (Marissa) 1. Reviewing proposals	

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Thinking about the GEAR program review process and survey. Few hundred responses so far. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> iii. APP (Julie) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discussed DANCE proposals to elevate to a standalone major 2. Conversation about crosslisting of course, grad classes in UG departments iv. APC <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nicole Jean Hill taking over 2. Final steps for Credit for Prior Learning Policy before sending out for review 	
9:20-9:45	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Report from Academic Programs <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Carmen summary - <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Pause on Health Advocacy proposal to Chancellor's office. GE courses associated with this proposal can move forward but other portions are on pause. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why the pause? Wanted to ensure that this was the right time to roll it out. A new health advisory committee is going to be developed that will likely better inform health programs. The program was unable to find a lead, and then the health program synergistically as part of the committee. ii. Will be attending a CSU-wide meeting. Will be discussing policy updates on GEAR and Credit for Prior Learning (and other EO and ABs). iii. Emphasized importance of making sure 120 units for each major and MAPs are clear because CO will bounce it back iv. Syllabi that are being collected this year and some are not following the syllabus policy. Encourage faculty to use the syllabus template. v. Allison Hodges joining as ACAC representative for GEAR 	Julie puts a note in her senate report about the Health Advocacy pause

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> vi. Kristin Hesseis also on GEAR from the Registrar's office vii. Reminder of close monitoring of programs not graduating at least 10 students per year <p>b. Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sara - What about the pushing of the liquid syllabus and how that works with the new syllabus policy? (Jim noted there is supposed to be an easy way to make it PDF) ii. Bori - Reminder of prior discussion on how the format set by the syllabus policy isn't helpful for students to read and understand iii. Josh - syllabi were sent back by CDC last year if they didn't comply iv. Julie - need to figure out how to communicate to faculty about the new policy and encourage them to follow it v. Justus - what is the stick to actually submit syllabi and ensure they are following policy? Is there good compliance for syllabus submission each semester? Carmen - we don't know yet and don't have the capacity to put effort into tracking it right now. vi. Julie - need more messaging to remind people about relevant parts of the syllabus policy (how to work with your liquid syllabus, updated information to include, etc). Mark - and need to say why it is important to submit them. Carmen - important for WASC. Marissa - many people do a good job with their syllabi, but some provide very little useful information. The syllabi website could be helpful even for current students if the instructor isn't providing much of it. vii. Jenni - implementation shouldn't be on APC. 	
9:45-10:15	<p>4. Discussion of new syllabus policy's requirement re: Program Review (Mark W.) Syllabus Policy Implications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Mark W. - Documentation and compliance is needed as part of the syllabus policy. How is this 	Next step - Julie leads discussion with APC and

	<p>going to happen? This includes making sure inclusion of information in the syllabus and also ensuring that students have the appropriate amount of work for the credits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Marissa - We have to do this as part of the policy. c. Justus - Same amount of work takes different people different amounts of time. How do we assess the “true” workload? What is “compliance” as meant by the policy. d. Jenni - be compliant with the policy pieces. For assessing, could be a sampling during program review or from submitted syllabi. e. Marisa - Want to make it a useful activity and not just checking a box. That probably falls into the department. Discussion with department faculty might be useful since faculty might not understand what is meant by 2 v. 4 units, etc. Julie - could this fall on department curriculum committees for larger departments? f. Carmen - is there a way to incorporate ACAC feedback since they are engaging with the students and seeing where they don't have the information they need. Allison - common things they work with are (1) grade calculations, (2) backwards planning for time management, (3) accessing previous syllabi to help decide how to build future schedules and pair courses. Some syllabi do not provide the information needed for these tasks. g. Further discussion on difficulties of assessing workload and how much time students actually spend. h. Marissa - Does it meet syllabus policy and does it seem to generally reflect the expected workload (no specific estimation of minutes)? May also be a conversation started with faculty when 	<p>other of messaging in Council of Chairs meetings</p> <p>Mark - write up a draft prompt for the self study to include in program review.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>expectations are not being met as part of the program review discussion among departments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Allison - faculty communications - especially important for first year students and they can learn how to be a college student. Important for student success. j. Justus - RTP? Syllabi submitted in files to prove teaching effectiveness, personnel review committees, new faculty mentors. Lots of places where things might be checked and help each other. Heather - this might be helpful to make a culture shift. GEAR recertification is another place where this can be checked. Someone come to Council of Chairs to explain the new syllabus policy? 	
10:15-10:30	<p>5. Discussion of consultation process for course/program changes (Julie and Justus)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Julie - Cameron will now ask people to do the impact report in Curriculog, and will require documentation of conversations to be included. (Example of issue recently with PHYX courses and chair did not know) b. Justus - ECON core course change proposal (taking 1 course and splitting it into 2 which increases units from 4 to 6 but also makes it better aligned with transfer courses) which also was a core course for a Business Admin program. BA said they didn't want the change. Justus mediated over 1.5 years. Now have versions of both courses on the books, but don't really need to offer them both since redundant courses. Enrolment isn't currently high enough to justify running both versions of the courses (although as people pointed out that might make sense - Chem does a similar thing with Organic Chem and Biochem). Larger issue - who owns the curriculum? 	<p>Didn't have enough time to complete the discussion. Will be brought up again at a later meeting.</p>

10:30-10:50	<p>6. Discussion of Sustainability designation process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Julie - intended to be an initial discussion to determine next steps and who to involve in future conversations. b. Jennifer Ortega (Sustainability Fellow) and Kayla Begay (Chair of Native American Studies) joined via Zoom c. Julie - Sustainability designation has implications on campus. But initial designations were done by people just looking through the catalog. Now we have a box in Curriculog that you can check. But who is deciding now who gets the designation if proposers check that box? More people outside of the ICC should be involved in making these decisions. d. Jennifer - Remind that this is a voluntary attribute that a course can have. It is not a requirement like GE. But what this might look like is different by discipline. e. Justus - representation on a subcommittee from each college, Sustainability office, and maybe some at large representation to review and work with faculty? They would make recommendations. Develop a rubric for the designation. Jennifer - there is an existing process. But this process does need to be updated. f. Sara - how many courses who want to be designated get rejected? Jennifer - often follow up with the instructor. Does not happen too often. g. Jenni - Suggest integrating existing process with ICC. Justus agreed in later comments, in addition to updating/refining the standards. h. Mark W. - ILO 2 is the sustainability ILO and the only one we can't verify that students have met it 	<p>Julie organizes/delegates meeting with Sustainability Office to have a conversation and seeks larger input</p>

	<p>(since there isn't a specific campus GEAR requirement).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Lisa - we don't have a committee of experts for other GEAR areas like GEAR; might consider if processes need to be aligned for all types of designations. We are making a committee of experts for sustainability, but why not for other areas like GEAR. Bori agrees. Sara - but what about the service designation which doesn't currently go through GEAR? j. Julie/Kayla - need to consider how to include TEK k. Bori - what about ILO on equity and social justice? Lisa - is a committee there for Area F, which helps to meet that. 	
<p>Up Next: Subcommittees: 9/26/23 Full Committee: 10/3/23</p>		

Consent Calendar

n/a

Voting Action Calendar

n/a