

Integrated Curriculum Committee Meeting  
October 6, 2009

Members Present: Jeff Abell, Jodie Baker, Jená Burges, Mary Ann Creadon, Valerie Green, Elizabeth Harrington, Judy Little, Sue MacConnie, Cindy Moyer (Chair). John Reiss, Brandon Schwab, Ronnie Swartz, Steve Smith, Eric Van Duzer, Harry Wells, Beth Wilson.

Guests Present: Mike Badenbaugh, Nathan Crnich, Timothy Daniels, Ken Fulgham, Richard Healy, Antony Kim, Thomas Larsen, Kathy Munoz, Justin Thorne, Robert Zoellner,

Minutes of Sept 29 approved with addition of Christina Accomando as present.

Consent Calendar was approved. It was noted that an ENGR 496 appeared on Sharepoint site, but not on this calendar. Jodie will clarify for next meeting.

**Program Planning and Assessment Committee report:** Beth Wilson

Beth presented a draft of a memo to all department chairs to be shared with all faculty concerning Assessment processes for this year. It includes a summary of what tasks the PPA is undertaking, including GE assessment guidelines concerning sample size, minimum of two readers of each student work, type of work assessed, rubric creation, etc., and standard report forms. Creation of an all university assessment rotation is also to be developed.

This year, departments will assess a programmatic learning outcome one semester and the designated GE learning outcome the other semester. All-university programs like Institutions and DCG, will be assessed in Spring 2010. An assessment timeline with deadlines was also attached.

Concerns were raised that the optional evaluation of GE to either semester, with no course specification to departments, would result in a lack of sufficient GE assessment. It was noted that HSU departments overall have a poor record of holding themselves responsible for outcomes assessment.

Due to a mix up in distribution, this memo will be reviewed and acted upon at the next meeting.

**Academic Master Planning Recommendations on Prioritization Category IV Programs:**

Applied Technology: Eric Van Duzer, Program Representative, AMP Shepherd: John Reiss

John reviewed the recommendation of the AMP circulated earlier, which was to eliminate Applied Technology. The primary reason cited was that the curriculum revision plan set forth was still not viable, with too many unique courses (especially in Construction Track) and with no tenure track faculty to sustain curriculum. Other reasons cited by AMP members was that a previous review with promise of revision and success did not show significant results, including the lack of projected collaboration with College of the Redwoods.

Response (Van Duzer): Fulltime faculty member hired did not implement the plan as projected. AT major is important to local industry, and could provide support for local niche manufacturing and construction. There has been an increase in majors, and this major is one of few CSU schools which have AT. Claims product design option can be offered without additional faculty.

(No vote taken due to lack of time.)

Rangeland Resources/Wildland Soils: Ken Fulgham, Program Representative, AMP Shepherd: Harry Wells

Harry reviewed the recommendation of the AMP circulated earlier, which was to eliminate Rangeland Resources/Wildland Soils. Even with a restructured major, there is not sufficient majors to make enrollment of courses. The primary problem is lack of student demand, with an average of 7 graduates per year over the last 8 years (Analytic Studies). The national picture does not indicate any change in low enrollment trends. The promise of external funding does not apply to funding course offerings.

Response (Fulgham): National trend is that there will be a job demand for graduates due to retirement of baby boomers. The department and the discipline in general would work on marketing to high school students. Assuming grant reception, there is a review of the discipline occurring nationally concerning adjustment of standards for licensing; suggests holding off action on HSU program pending that outcome. Two tracks required to two terminal degrees necessary for entrance score of 90 (strengthening employment over scores of 70 or 80).

Further points raised

- a) Stated need for two terminal tracks does not address Dean's concern that these courses will not enroll sufficiently
- b) If this program is so strong in curriculum (which it is), why are students not choosing it? Are there too many programs in the US?
- c) Since entrance level scores do not have to be at 90 for certification toward employment, could there be a configuration of courses that are not a major, but could meet the lower scores? (Fulgham said he had not considered that, and did not know.)
- d) Further points raised later in committee deliberation:

Other points raised later in committee deliberation:

\*Soils is enrolled better than Range Could Soils be an option in another major? Certification acceptable under another major?

\* Prioritization process with three faculty review committees carried out in a campus wide comparative process. In comparison with all other programs, and in relation to criteria, deemed this program unsustainable for our campus. Need to keep that comparative view in decision making.

\*The Provost recommendation gave room for bringing forth a minor, but the program Committee did not bring forth such a proposal, nor one geared toward a lower certification score.

\* Question ultimately is: Can we afford keeping a low enrolled program that insists on a configuration of courses with terminal tracks that are not viable?

Committee voted for elimination of the Rangeland Resources Program, 11 for elimination, 3 against elimination, 1 abstention.

Athletic Training Option: Program Representative, Kathy Muñoz, AMP Shepherd: Ronnie Swartz

Swartz indicated that the program itself recommended elimination. Munoz indicated that faculty could not meet needs of students. Have nearly 50 majors, but only graduating 6-8 because did not have the necessary placements for them. Also, accreditation now requires stand alone major and there is no way HSU can meet that.

Committee voted unanimously for elimination of Athletic Training Option.

Chemical Technology Option in Chemistry: Program Representative: Robert Zoellner, AMP Shepherd: Mary Ann Creadon

All parties support elimination. Bob Zollner explained this was an experiment that never did flourish.

Committee voted unanimously for elimination of this option.

Environmental Toxicology Option in Chemistry: Program Representative: Robert Zoellner, AMP Shepherd: Mary Ann Creadon

All parties support elimination. Bob Zoellner explained that the two unique courses did not serve any other program on campus, and thus will be eliminated..

Committee voted unanimously for elimination of this option.

Physical Science Major and Minor: Program Representative: Robert Zoellner; Jena Burgess (Physical Science)

It was emphasized that both major and minor are recommended for elimination by the department. This is uncontested, though the department points out there are no cost savings in terms of course elimination. It was pointed out that there are always administrative costs, e.g. registrar's office, and removal of any program reduces those costs.

Committee voted unanimously for elimination of this major and minor.

Liberal Studies Non-Teaching: Program Representative: Jená Burges, AMP Shepherd: Steve Smith

Given this program has no academic home, and thus no mechanism for developing and assessing student learning outcomes, oversight of curriculum cohesion, writing plan, etc., and no department is wanting to embrace it and develop these things, the recommendation is to suspend this program. No new students are to be admitted into it, and the 60-70 majors in it presently will continue to receive advising from Advising Center.

Committee voted unanimously for suspension of this major. Following present guidelines, if the suspension is not lifted in five years, it will be eliminated.

General Process for finalization of memos to Senate:

Sue will develop a template that outlines the process engaged, and criteria used, which will be included in all memos, with shepherds revising to indicate arguments made in relation to the criteria. These revised memos should be circulated to the ICC prior to next week's meeting.