California State University, Hayward  
Committee on Instruction and Curriculum  
Minutes of the meeting of Monday, Jan. 8th, 2001  

Approved as corrected

Members present: Kevin Cadogan, Terry Kelly (chair), Dave Larson, Rita Liberti, Leigh Mintz, and Kelly Steele

Members absent: Evelyn Padua-Andrews, Judith Faust, Barbara Paige, Steve Starling, and Steve Ugbah

Guests: Julie Glass, Rosanne Moore, Michael J. Strait (Director, Assessment and Testing)

The meeting was called to order at approximately 2:50 by the chair.

1. The agenda was approved

2. Minutes were approved with the following corrections. Rita Liberti was absent at the meeting of Nov. 20th, 2000 and Emily Brizendine, Linda Kinrade, and Gale Young were not guests at the meeting of Nov. 20th, 2000

3. Report of the Chair: There was no report from the Chair.

4. Report of Associate Vice President, Curriculum & Academic Programs:
The Academic Senate approved CIC 7, 8, and 9 on November 28, 2000. CIC 10 is on the ExComm agenda tomorrow.


6a. G.E. Proposal - PHIL 3720 (Cultural Groups/Women) was approved unanimously.

6b. Setting Goals Under the Accountability Process: As requested by the Chair of the Academic Senate, Emily Stoper, the committee initiated discussion of the goals of the accountability process adopted by the CSU system. The committee was specifically requested to give input with respect to goals for Indicators #1, # 3.2, and # 8, as formulated by the Chancellor's Office last year. Discussion of Indicator # 1 was postponed until the next meeting and after receiving some input from the campus Assessment Council.

Discussion of Indicator # 3.2: The question before CIC is whether to recommend lowering the units required for a degree from 186 to 180. This would imply lowering the upper division requirement to 90 units. Vice President Mintz pointed out that 44 of the 54 departments could easily accommodate this lower number by reducing free electives. In 8 of the remaining departments, lowering the upper division requirement to 90 would impact only some options. In two departments (Engineering & Health Science) the required courses would have to be altered or reduced to fit into a 180 unit degree. Considering that most students significantly exceed the current 186 unit minimum when they graduate, the question was raised as to what impact lowering the minimum would have? The advantage of the 186 unit limit is that it encourages
more breadth in learning. The assumption behind the proposal to reduce the mandatory units to 180 is that it would assist the "timely completion of the degree". Committee members voiced some skepticism about this assumption because the great majority of students now exceed the limit of 186. Other factors were considered as perhaps more important obstacles to the timely completion of the degree, such as insufficient advising, changing of majors, and scheduling around work. Improved on-line advising was discussed and Rosanne Moore explained that the university was having difficulties implementing on line advising using Degree Works software. Discussion of Indicator # 8: This indicator is meant to measure Facilities Utilization and CIC is requested to make recommendations regarding utilization goals as percentage of university instruction that takes place at times and locations other than the traditional Monday through Thursday daytime on the campus. Six categories of non-traditional times or places are listed in the memorandum from the Chair of the Academic Senate (a through f). In the discussion some questions were first raised about the meaning of some categories. For example: What is meant by Fridays? There are a number of courses that meet M, W, F. Does the category, Fridays (b), exclude them? There are also a number of courses that meet before 4 pm but continue well after 4 pm. Does the category Evenings after 4(a) exclude them? If the answer to either of these questions is yes, then the numbers will underestimate the 'non-traditional' time utilization of university facilities. Also, as the Chair of the Academic Senate stated in the memorandum, there is some confusion about the meaning of the category Distance learning (e). Should it include courses taught online but utilizing some campus facilities? If the answer is no, then it will underestimate the off-site utilization. A question was also raised as to whether further increasing the percent of university courses taught in non-traditional times/places will actually increase the efficiency of university facility usage. In campuses such as CSUH, which have experienced slow growth, expanding the non-traditional usage may result more in a spreading out of existing FTE rather than an expansion. It can be argued that reducing the traditional time/place courses would reduce the efficiency of university facility usage. It might also lower the quality of the college experience by reducing interactions among faculty and students. Discussion will be continued at the next meeting.

It was decided to send out a brief questionnaire to all department chairs with one question concerning indicator # 3.2 and two questions concerning Indicator # 8. Director Michael Strait volunteered to send out the questionnaire for the committee.

Because the committee was requested to respond to the Academic Senate by mid February, it was decided to have the next CIC meeting on Monday, February 5th.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:40 pm by the Chair.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Cadogan, acting secretary