

ICC Minutes for Tuesday, April 12, 2011

Nelson Hall East, Room 106

Members Present: Jeff Abell, Jodie Baker, Jená Burges, Mary Ann Creadon, Elisabeth Harrington, Sonya Hildreth, Chris Hopper, Mary Kay, Cindy Moyer (Chair), Dale Oliver, Anne Paulet, Scott Paynton, Clint Rebik, John Reiss, Brandon Schwab, Sheila Steinberg, Ronnie Swartz, Beth Wilson

Guests: Mary Beth Cunha, Ken Fulgham, Steve Martin, Mahesh Rao, Bethany Rizzardi

| Agenda Item | Action/Next Steps |
|---|---|
| 1. Approval of Minutes with corrections | Approved |
| <p>2. Consent Calendar</p> <p>10-332: BA 250: Financial Accounting: Change C-class from 3 units C-4 and one unit of C-13 to 4 units C-4 because class is currently taught as 4 contact hours of discussion/lecture/participation. This change reduces the WTU from 4.3 to 4.0.</p> <p>10-333: ENGR 333: Fluid Mechanics add Math 210 as a pre-requisite (to correct the earlier error in which Math 210 was removed from the pre-requisite chain by the removal of ENG 333 as a pre-req.)</p> <p>10-334: ENGR 299: Directed Study – new course proposal creating a directed study course appropriate for lower-division students</p> | Approved |
| <p>3. AMP</p> <p>Geospatial Task Force Proposal</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Endorse proposed courses 2. Establish Geospatial Steering Committee <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Membership:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Faculty member from each department offering GSP courses: (Geography, ESM, Forestry, CS) 1 Faculty from a department whose students and faculty use Geospatial Analysis 1 ITS representative <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Discussion summary: A steering committee will be in place to guide updates, review, and changes. This is an array of courses, not a program. ICC is being asked to approve a theoretical, abstract concept that once approved, the steering committee will move forward to develop the concept into actionable items. Much discussion regarding options at HSU, how this proposal fits into minor offerings, resource issues (human, additional GE units), common GSP prefix issues (semi-conclusion on GSP prefix: assuming that the University can guarantee that use of the prefix will not affect accounting of FTEs and faculty resources, the ICC (mostly) is in favor of using the GSP prefix.)</p> <p>Draft letter to Low-enrolled minors</p> | <p>#1 approved concept of proposed courses that then must go through curr. Process for approval.</p> <p>#2 approved establishment of steering committee to move proposal forward.</p> <p>Draft letter approved and will be sent out</p> |
| <p>4. APC nothing today – see project list at the end of the agenda</p> <p>5. PPA nothing today – see project list at the end of the agenda</p> <p>6. CDC nothing today – see project list at the end of the agenda</p> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>7. Brainstorming – how is the ICC working? What should change? Discussion to include...</p> <p>7.1 Revise procedures – require proposals go to Dean? How to make sure we catch changes that affect other programs? What is the best way to catch issues with pre-requisite chains? Better communication with departments – do their proposals disappear into the ICC? How can they track progress? How do they know the proposal has been approved? (<i>New letter when proposals received. Merry will send approved Senate consent calendar to all Department Chairs.</i>) Jodie- OAA #s in email communications? CDC workload and timing? Are earlier deadlines appropriate? New GE courses/DCG/ etc. – Do we concern ourselves with questions of enrollment balance and affects on other departments? (Is this a question for Enrollment management?) Eric: what is the appropriate role of the APC/CDC/ICC in relation to disciplinary curriculum and value judgments as it relates to what is in the best interest of majors in a particular program. Eric: How will we evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the ICC process/structure? Assessment needs outcomes and at some point we should have a conversation about what we need to measure to continuously improve the ICC. Jodie: What if something is completely approved and then the Registrar’s office discovers that it won’t work?</p> | <p>7.1 When a # is assigned to a new course proposal, Jodie’s staff will Cc. the appropriate college associate dean – docs available on sharepoint to view.</p> <p>Remainder of points deferred to next meeting.</p> |
| <p>8. Hours worked</p> <p>Discussion: Concern expressed regarding how ICC and subcommittees will be able to do the work believed to be important without consideration of assigned time in some instances. One note that faculty have declined HSU committee service due to the amount of work without assigned time.</p> | <p>Cindy will keep pointing out the hours faculty put into ICC work, but will not actively fight for release time at the present time.</p> |
| <p>9. Dual-level co-scheduled Grad/Undergrad courses</p> <p>How do these fit in the curriculum? Is this okay? How much is okay? What standards are appropriate for approving these? When should we not approve these?</p> | <p>Deferred to next meeting</p> |

Adjourned: 10:58 a.m.