

ICC MINUTES Tuesday, 21 August 2012, first meeting of the academic year

PRESENT: Jeff Abell, Emiliano Ayala, Jodie Baker, Joan Berman (9:30), Wesley Bliven, Jená Burges, Chris Harmon, Elisabeth Harrington, Benjamin Marschke, Cindy Moyer, Anne Paulet, Scott Paynton, Clint Rebik, Brandon Schwab, Ronnie Swartz, Rick Zechman
GUEST: TC Comet

Minutes from last meeting approved

CONSENT CALENDAR	
<p>11-207: Kinesiology Program Change Replace ZOO 374: Intro to Human Anatomy with ZOO 270: Human Anatomy because ZOO 374 has been deleted in response to the elimination of the nursing program.</p> <p>11-335: HED 444: Worksite Health Promotion – suspend course, has not been offered recently, content is absorbed into other courses</p> <p>11-404: ENVS 482: Internship – change title to “Environmental Science Internship,” change units from variable 2-3 to 1-3 so that it can be used for a new Geospatial Conservation Science option in ENVS, remove ENVS 410 as pre-req because that information is not needed</p> <p>11-551: Kinesiology: Physical Education Teaching – delete HED 444 from list of courses in “Additional Requirement”</p> <p>11-552: Kinesiology: Exercise Science – delete HED 444 from list of courses in the Concentration section</p> <p>11-553: Liberal Studies Child Development Minor Program Change add CD 251: Children, Families and their Communities to the list of options under Family Relations. The department intended to include this course in the minor; the change corrects the omission.</p> <p>11-566: Environmental Science Program Change move FISH 476: Ecology of Running Waters from the list of required courses to a list of electives <i>and</i> increase the number of required electives from one to two. Total number of units will remain the same. Rationale: student demand for FISH 476 was so high that students could not get into the course. Moving it to an elective will help spread the demand and allow students to complete the degree in a timely fashion. The ENVS faculty feel that the material is FISH 476 is not essential material that every student must be required to take the course, but it will remain as an elective for students with particular interests in the subject.</p> <p>11-568 BIOL 340: Genetics Change Statistics pre-req from STAT 109 to STAT 108 or 109 because STAT 108 has equivalent content to STAT 109 and provides adequate preparation for BIOL 340.</p> <p>11-569 BIOL 330: Principles of Ecology Change Statistics pre-req from STAT 109 to STAT 108 or 109 because STAT 108 has equivalent content to STAT 109</p>	<p>Jená wants to hold Criminal Justice minor (11-572) because should not change name until change curriculum so sent to AMP</p> <p>ENVS 482 removes prereq of practicum which is an internship and wanted to know why then have both and why don't need 410. Worried motivated by issues of staffing and class size rather than pedagogy (Greg) In core, Jodie noted, 410 OR 411 so may be because if took 411 then could not take 482. PULL and investigate (Cindy)</p> <p>REST APPROVED</p>

<p>and provides adequate preparation for BIOL 330. 11-572: Criminal Justice Minor – change name to “Criminology and Justice Studies” Minor to match the name of the newly-approved major.</p>	
<p>TC Comet – Identification of and Inventory of Sustainability Courses</p>	
<p>TC will review what has been done on this initiative, and what could happen in the future. Biggest question for us: what will our role be in this process? (See supporting documents: List of approved SUST courses and Process used to make Sustainability course Designations.)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Publish the list of Sustainability courses in the catalog 2) The Registrar's office is working on finding a way to make a "Sustainability" designation in the course numbers/catalog/schedule 3) We need to figure out a process for maintaining the list of Sustainability courses. When a Sust-designated course is revised, who would check that the course still meets the Sust-standards? What about identifying new Sust-courses? 4) At what point in the process of developing Sustainability curriculum do we need to develop clear Sustainability SLOs? 	<p>TC: First effort of committee was to get list of courses which meet sustainability to some degree. Settled for descriptions rather than definitions. Process provided at left. Showed leaf logo. Discussed permutations that might develop from identifying sustainability courses. Committee just wanted to identify so can begin discussion about how might move forward. Trying to get faculty mixer sometime early fall semester to present the ways it has been done elsewhere and to get discussion going about minor, major, part of GE, first year experience or what. Have initial list—how do we maintain it and what do we do with it and what is ICC role? Don't have enough info from faculty and departments to determine whether we should develop learning outcomes which would then lead to definitions which could be applied to better clarify list.</p> <p>Jená: Initial vision was that this would be a graphic vision of what was already there but then steering committee began to think about honors, minors, options all of which would require tracking so no longer merely a graphical representation and that makes it a curricular change.</p> <p>Scott: definitions are great because simple. Do wonder as a first step has GE committee or your group looked to see if there is a sustainability focused GE without changing anything except graphic?? NO Might be worth the effort to see if such a thing is possible without making any real changes. Seems like could be labeled and put in catalog easily. Might make a good starting point.</p> <p>TC: Steering committee would be happy to do that just wasn't comfortable moving further without guidance.</p> <p>Jeff: what is primary motivation—if for students then great, if for marketing then maybe just a buzz word we are latching on to [Scott offered background from Cabinet for Institutional Change: we are being beaten by other campuses in selling sustainability which we actually do better. Effort to combine curriculum to make more coherent and aligning with initiatives that are going on around campus]</p> <p>Cindy: Probably when we get to stage of SLOs and defn. will probably result in some of the things on the list being removed which may result in unhappiness so may be better to do sooner rather than later so people don't get used to being on the list. Says could not put a sustainability on list since no Arts and Area A would need to be reworked.</p> <p>Ben: Cynical so if only marketing then put leaves OK if that all doing. Who is going to run this if we are doing something more than that? Concerned about GE</p> <p>Brandon: appreciate wanting to make it inclusive in terms of vision but really unclear to him and will make it very difficult</p>

for CDC or other curriculum committees to be able to use. Need more coherent definition if we are really planning to move forward.

Wes: Makes a tremendous amount of sense to market what we do and that it should be coherent but believes that shoehorning into GE would just be a mess. If all marketing then OK. If really want to make this a main thing then do it all the way, don't just sneak.

Jeff: much better to start with a small set of courses rather than a big list. Suggest re-vetting list. Any moniker we attach to courses should come from faculty. Should ask faculty if they want to be on list. Feel should submit forms just like DCG.

Scott: shudder at asking faculty if want to be on list because perpetuate faculty owned courses. At very least should be on department level. Mentioned classes with multiple sections.

Jeff: Cool with him. Department is faculty.

Ben: reiterate what Wes said—will this be like DCG? Or if a program then worried might be like international studies, which seems to have a lot of handshake deals. If only marketing then sure list that we have loads of courses.

Elisabeth: make sure faculty know and want to be on the list. Make sure it does not devolve into some sort of competition, no pressure immediately for that. Invited them to come to GEAR committee when up and running to discuss.

Jená: need to point out that this is merely a clearer representation of what the course description already says. Sustainability is a broad concept which is something we all need to recognize. Want a way to show students and prospective students and to track students' taking of the courses if that would be useful. There may be some program or an honors designation. Place to start is to take inventory of where are we and then give permission to registrar to add to catalog and then that give basic information to build on in ways that are meaningful without paperwork

Chris: need to run a comb through this list. Something like larger courses might have issues with difference in way it is taught in different sections.

Ronnie: Hearing that not every chair checked with faculty so might make sense for a third go around that highlights that chair should run by faculty members. Seem to remember linking sustainability to SLOs to class so regardless of who teaches it is part of course

TC: Selection was based on course description only and tried to be very inclusive in how we read courses. If could then looked at SLOs on syllabus. Tried to be inclusive as much as possible. Hoping for broader discussion. Many of discussions already held were very informative. Mentioned examples from other campuses. Warning from others that easy to get mired in definition. Part of it is definitely marketing but should perhaps be more than that, this is just a start. Key question is still how to maintain. Can probably volunteer committee to review list periodically until it is not really appropriate for them to do so.

Anne: want definition

TC: all of these comments were what was wrestled with in committee.

Cindy: Clear tried to make good list and clear that still problems. Want to be confident that leaves do apply to course and students don't feel got caught in false advertising so really important that list is solid enough so something to it

Jená: steering committee should meet again, comb through, send to chairs with description, more clear instructions, and offer to come to meeting. Ask department chairs to work with department and faculty to commit to courses they want on list and then steering committee can collect list and forward to registrar as OK to leaf.

Ronnie: give people at least three weeks

Elisabeth: list of words comment

TC: embarking on 4-5 month process of sustainability assessment of campus

Emiliano: would encourage as departments work through this to collect questions remaining in department to help find out

Jeff: Would it be easier to start with sustainability focus courses? We could probably do this, after all this is our purview as a body. We are the ones who are responsible for course designations so we need to make the final say.

SUMMARY: we are recommending that we refine the list and immediate question for us is are we comfortable with a refined list created with this present set up going into the catalog brains and what is the long term implications. Should leaves be in print and not in brains.

Chris: all for focused in Print.

Jeff: if goes in catalog then go in brain

Anne: uncomfortable in brains until more precise.

If not in brains then makes more work and students will not see if not online.

Jeff: Anne's comment would not be an issue if definitions were clear up front

Wes: More pinned down if going to do something more than a list in the front

Jená: if going to advertise then need to follow through

Wes: completely agrees but then REALLY need to know what is going on in that course and we are starting down this path of designation with very little oversight. [Jená: committee task] so then not our job? [we take recommendation]

Scott: one of things that frustrated about Senate was we would send things to the subcommittee and then not trust their answers. Concerned that is what we are doing. If we are going to do something significantly different then sure we can start over. Eventually will need to deal with how get on or not.

Ben: Don't think want to do things differently, we just want to see what it is going to be. Is it going to be like DCG or a marketing rubber stamp or a major/minor program. Cart in front of horse to say we are going to designate courses when we don't know where going.

Cindy: would be thrilled to have faculty really explore this in greater depth—major, minor, etc.

	<p>Brandon: if we say go ahead with the solid or open stamp then any of those things would come through program so maybe no harm no foul</p> <p>Jeff: leaves have power and can't underestimate. Question substance. Don't know what "sustainability" means. Let's make sure definition is really solid and meaningful.</p> <p>Emiliano: What rush?</p> <p>TC: Went through process to get inventory. Wanted it ready for students to see. We have had a list on the sustainability website created by marketing department for two years. We do have assessment being started with particular credit implications. Allowing us to enter the discussion of what is next. Students have expressed frustration to his office and others that there is no way to figure out what courses are sustainability related.</p> <p>Emiliano: curious to see how they would define it.</p> <p>RECOMMEND refining of the list</p> <p>Rick: insufficient dialog with departments—no, got response;</p> <p>Scott: real problem with chairs and faculty; so what if sent department the list and what makes these courses sustainable.</p> <p>Anne: issue with definition!</p> <p>Scott: surely there must be a set of criteria? This is lifted directly from criteria [TC]</p> <p>TC we can go back to departments again but I don't know what it would do</p> <p>Jody: how about a simple questionnaire for courses that want to come on board. Agree with list at front of the catalog but separate. Agree with list in catalog and in brains. Gives us the ability to move forward.</p> <p>VOTE: if comfortable having after a third go around listed in the brains and associated then raise hand. Vote failed</p> <p>Clint: need definition—look at Chico</p> <p>Jeff: get definition, attach that with the final and last request from chairs and tell them to get faculty involved and then ask if courses fit one of categories. Would be comfortable with that.</p> <p>TC: will come up with year to come up with definition</p> <p>Ronnie: Higher Education site has definition</p> <p>TC not willing to accept</p> <p>Scott: maybe this is an ICC issue to come up with definition</p> <p>TC: could come back with range of options to ICC.</p> <p>VOTE: OK with list in front of catalog of focused ones PASSED</p> <p>VOTE: OK with list of focused AND related ones FAILED</p>
<p>CDC CURRICULUM PROPOSALS</p>	
<p>09-453: ES 310: U.S. & Mexico Border – change from international to domestic DCG</p> <p>No recommendation from CDC – some concern that this course is not sufficiently domestic to qualify. Hopefully ICC will reach a conclusion; if not we will invite faculty from the department next week.</p> <p>11-148: Spanish Level IV – add non-domestic DCG</p> <p>No recommendation from CDC – some</p>	<p>Scott: was purely focus on SW US an relation to borderlands</p> <p>Jeff: says OK with domestic</p> <p>Scott to work with ES to get course description change and syllabus change to reflect primary domestic so can get DCG designation as domestic.</p> <p>Scott: ok about going to go for DCG unclear why 107 yes then why not 207 so issue</p>

<p>concern that the faculty have not demonstrated how the course meets the DCG standards. Hopefully ICC will reach a conclusion; if not we will invite faculty from the department next week.</p> <p>Note: the most recent versions of the DCG approval standards are with other documents for this meeting on Sharepoint.</p>	<p>Cindy: can we vote or do we need more information with current forms?</p> <p>INVITE WLC to CDC ask to talk to them and clarify</p>
<p>APC: Major/Minor combinations – discussion</p>	<p>Did not get to</p>
<p>GEAR Committee report</p>	<p>Did not get to</p>
<p>ICC Self-evaluation</p>	<p>Did not get to</p>