CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM

DRAFT Minutes of the Meeting of April 7, 2014

Present: Jennifer Eagan, Barbara Hall, Yi He, Keith Kravitz, Danika LeDuc (Secretary), James Murray (Chair), Susan Opp, Nancy Thompson

Absent: Andrew Carlos, Brian Cook, Cristian Gaedicke, Jim Mitchell, Michelle Xiong, Gaozong Yang

Guests: Sarah Aubert, Kyle Burch, Endre Branstad, Jiansheng Guo, Vish Hegde, Ann McPartland, Zinovy Radovilsky, Sophie Rollins, Angela Schneider, Mitch Watnik, Jiming Wu, Chongqi Wu

1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P (Murray/Opp)
   Passed unanimously.

2. Approval of the minutes of March 3, 2014
   M/S/P (LeDuc/He)
   Murray found a typo “I” on top of page 3.
   Amended minutes approved unanimously.

3. Report of the Chair
   Murray explained that ExCom sent a proposal from ITAC back regarding learning management systems with the idea that CIC should weigh in. CIC should have members on ITAC to guide choice of learning management systems. Eagan further explained that ExCom thought membership on the committee was a little thin and that expertise was needed from faculty teaching online, a representative of MATS, and a member of FAC.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   Opp introduced Kyle Burch, new articulation officer in APGS, coming from National Hispanic University. Murray asked how articulation works. Opp explained that course information is sent from community colleges for department chairs to evaluate. This process has become more complicated under SB1440, i.e. “a degree with a guarantee”, in that transfer students coming in with 90 quarter units must be able to finish in 90 more units. With Course Match (discussed later) we will also need to articulate CSU to CSU.

5. Old Business:
   a. Fifth-year students and registration
      AACE Director Larry Bliss was not present to continue discussion on this issue.
6. New Business
   a. MSBA Option Resumption

   Radovilksy, Chair of Department of Management, CBE, introduced Chongqi Wu and Jiming Wu, who would be co-directors of the program, and Vish Hegde, also of the department. A MSBA ITM (Masters of Science in Business Analytics Information Technology Management) option started in 2008. The program was suspended in 2011 because of consistently low demand and resource limitations. The faculty evaluated programs at other universities and concluded that demand for employees with this education currently exceeds supply. For example, in February, there were 3400 business analyst jobs in Bay Area listed on indeed.com. The 8 programs in the area (5 graduate, 3 certificate) produce only 200 – 300 students each year. Chevron and LinkedIn confirmed they will hire graduates from such a program. The program will be at least 45 units with four main parts: 2 fundamental courses, 6 required courses, five electives from a pool of 7, and 1 unit of capstone project.

   The program revision requires four new courses and two course modifications. These have been reviewed by CBE Dean, Associate Dean, Director of Graduate Program, ITM and OP/SCM faculty, and 3 outside experts in big data and business analytics. The department has sufficient resources to offer the courses with 2 new TT hires in OP&SCM and 1 new TT in HRM starting in Fall 2014. The target enrollment is 30 – 50 students. Recruitment will be done with direct marketing (reaching out to graduating CSUEB students and alumni), using Graduate Management Admissions Search Service, and outreach to professionals.

   Eagan asked if why enrollment won’t be low now. Wu said that the financial situation is better than 3 years ago and that the program has been revised to be more relevant to students’ needs. Radovilksy added that there is substantial demand in big data analytics and a market void in such specialists; there are over 3000 such positions in Bay Area, but local universities are producing only 200 – 300 per year. Murray asked about the difference between a MSBA and a MB. Radovilksy explained that the MBA is more general and that the students would get solid knowledge in big data analytics through required courses. LeDuc asked if one or more of the new courses could be used by other students toward their degree. Radovilksy answered that students in the MBA option would be able to have more courses in data analytics, Murray asked how the fundamental courses could count for 0 – 8 units. Radovilksy explained that this requirement can be waived if the student took similar courses in the past 5 years. Murray noted that the course modification documents should have a more detailed justification rather than “part of program revision.” He further noted that the forms for courses 6280 and 6285 should have the box checked under 3c that they are not replacing any courses since they are brand-new courses. Murray thought 1 unit for a capstone project seems small. Opp explained that this is common-place for projects. Radovilksy said the capstone project has a large list of pre-requisite courses and the student must pick a topic on data analytics and work with advisor.
M/S/P (Murray/Eagan)
Unanimous.

b. 13-14 CIC 25: Approval of CHEM 1610 and 1615 for B1 Status
M/S/P (Murray/Opp)
McPartland explained that these are really the same course and that 1615 is the designation specifically for the freshmen cluster, pre-nursing chemistry courses. Due to changes in Chancellor’s Office policy, pre-nursing pre-requisites are undergoing changes. As such, the Chemistry & Biochemistry department has consolidated two quarter courses (4 units each) and replaced with one course (6 units). The previous courses had GE designation and were part of a cluster. These courses have already been approved as new courses. Eagan said that the revisions are good, but that it is unfortunate this needs to be done. She appreciates the department trying to accommodate curriculum issues and the work involved. Opp explained that it is actually worse than Eagan thought. It is the state that has decided only one chemistry course can be required as a nursing pre-requisite.
Passed unanimously.

c. 13-14 CIC 26: Revised policy for Online & Hybrid Instruction
M/S/P (Murray/Opp)
Murray explained this was an attempt to making our online teaching policy consistent with state documentation. The goal was to make it as comprehensive as possible, but general enough to be applicable for an appreciable amount of time. Opp commended Murray for the huge amount of work he put into leading this. Murray thanked Opp and cited the work of the whole committee. He noted that one part remains vague regarding absolutely certain for proctoring exams, technology and instruction sub-committee. Eagan was chair of CIC when the first hybrid/online policy was written, 08/09. She mentioned that point B8 on p. 3 could be more strongly worded regarding class size. Physical classrooms help limit size; no such limit for online. Faculty members have reported caps in online classes disappearing without their consent. She is concerned that some might view online instruction as lending itself to maximizing population. As such, departments should be responsible for setting appropriate course caps in an online environment. They should not necessarily change when a faculty member agrees since a junior faculty member might feel pressured to “take one for the team.” Murray asked how course caps are chosen. Opp answered that the course classification dictates the cap when the course is first proposed. When scheduled, it can be different and can be changed by a staff member. She then asked Eagan if the phrasing “size limits should mirror standards and concerns for traditional courses” was not sufficient to address her concerns. Eagan suggested “Department policy should determine the appropriate class size for online/hybrid courses.” Thompson assented her concern that some see online instruction as a magic bullet when it often can be more intensive. Eagan
agreed that many students don’t like online as it is a lot of work for students and faculty. LeDuc agreed it is difficult when a course is not on your schedule. Students and faculty may take on too many other commitments. Workload issues are important. Guo asked if the 24 hour response time mentioned in the policy (A1) is reasonable. LeDuc considered it a good goal. Opp said it serves as something to point to. Eagan asked if the language on office hours matches policy document. Opp noted that in 9 – 10 FAC3, office hours for online classes can be held online or by telephone but must include at least 1 hour in which the instructor is available by telephone. Watnik suggested including “Faculty are required to follow current office hour policy for online instruction.” Opp recommended also including details of what the policy is now. Passed unanimously.

d. 13-14 CIC 27: Approval of CHEM 3080 for B6 Status
M/S/P (Opp/Kravitz)
LeDuc explained that this course, Hands On Chemistry lab, would allow our undergraduate students a chance to learn and teach basic chemistry to field trips of children visiting our campus. Murray asked about assessments. LeDuc answered that students would have a final exam based on the chemistry concept inventory, journal entries on content and pedagogy, would practice teaching and give feedback to their peers in a modified lesson study protocol. Kravitz asked if it was the intention to keep the class open to all students. LeDuc replied that students would have to get fingerprinted and pass a criminal background check. This is University policy and state law when interacting with minors.
Vote: 7 yes’s, 0 no’s, 1 abstention

e. Course modification request for Online Teaching
Opp explained that this was a request to create a new prefix, EDUI (interdisciplinary). It would apply only to courses for those students in the Online Teaching and Learning program and serving self-support. The hope is that with a new prefix students will not be confused.
M/S/P (Opp/Eagan)
Passed unanimously.

f. CSUEB Policy on Course Matching
Opp explained that students have always been able to do intercampus concurrent enrollment. Since it is a little complicated, not a lot of students do it. There previously was a push for CSUs to accept any online course. However, this was rethought. Since the CSUs collectively have lots of online courses, they could be made available to each other. The program was initially called ICE then OCE and now Course Match. Students at quarter campuses can only take classes from other quarter campuses. Students at semester campuses can only take classes from other semester campuses. GE-designated
courses will be honored. If a course is for majors, articulation has to be approved by departments. Murray asked how courses are added to this program. Opp said that the classes have to have space, and most of ours run totally full. The campus has thus far only put forward two courses. A request to do so came from Linda Dobb. There are many complicating factors such as the campus enrollment target. LeDuc asked where students from other campuses come in with respect to registration. Schneider replied after 2nd pass. Opp said that in order for a course to be included in Course Match it must be regularly offered and have reasonable enrollment. Information on grades, student learning outcomes, and syllabi must be submitted as quality assurance. Murray asked if CIC wants to have some sort of policy on what courses move forward. Opp said that this is a moving target. Schneider said that this is a high-profile program and there have been lots of discussions of how to move forward. There have also been different rumors. Eagan said that she would like some discussion amongst the faculty of which courses should be put forward into this high-profile environment, ideally our marquis best. Opp advised keeping an eye on it. It could be helpful for our students in finishing by getting into classes. He asked if there was a system in place to make sure that students enrolled meet admissions requirements. Schneider said that they rely on the home campus to do that. Opp recommended not putting business classes forward and accepting only accredited classes. Putting classes with lots of pre-requisites in Course Match would be very complicated. Thompson asked if we will have a formal articulation agreement as one student has asked her. Opp replied that it is not going to be on Assist. Department will need to decide, but we accept GE from other CSUs. Murray concluded that at this point we don’t need to anything explicitly.

g. ASI Resolution on Academic Advising
Murray asked if there was a mechanism in place to make and distribute copies of advisement report as requested in document. Opp said that this request assumes all advising occurs face-to-face and on paper. There are other tools available, i.e. advisor notes. Consultants will come to campus to make these more functional. Murray said that his previous institution a student must graduate in 4 years unless they don’t do what their advisors say. Watnik commented that even as a graduate advisor, he can’t see advisees on PeopleSoft. Schneider thought this was a SARF issue. Eagan suggested that all regular faculty members are given permission. Opp responded that many chairs don’t want faculty to have access or just ignored request for information. Eagan agreed that maybe some faculty should not be advisors. Watnik sits with ASI Board and explained that this part of the resolution was really based on couple of anecdotes in which a student went to an advisor, was told they could do certain things, and then, a year later, was told they couldn’t do that. The advisor was overruled. Students want a paper trail. Opp asked if it was a professional advisor or faculty advisor. Guo said it was a professional advisor.
7. From the floor
   N/A
8. Adjournment
   Murray (3:48)