CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM

Minutes of Meeting of February 5, 2007

Members of CIC Present: Carl Bellone, Tom Cadwallader, Jennifer Eagan (Chair), Kyzyl Fenno-Smith, Steve Peng, Jeffery Seitz, Erica Wildy, Hongwei Du

CIC Members Absent: Meiling Wu, Jeff Simons, Denise Wong, Student Rep (to be appointed)

Guests: Rosanne Harris, Sally Murphy, Jean Wells

The meeting was called to order at 2:45 p.m.

1. Approval of Agenda
   MSP Seitz/Fenno-Smith 7/0/0, to approve the agenda as amended.

2. Approval of CIC Minutes
   Minutes from December 4: MSP (Fenno-Smith/Wildy) to approve 7-0-0.
   Minutes from January 8: MSP (Cadwallader/Fenno-Smith) to approve 7-0-0.

3. Confirmation of Approval of CIC 11, GE Provisional Course Approval Process
   Chair Eagan explained that this is the policy that was reviewed by Excom. However, there is contradiction to the enrollment procedure menu, which may have been out of date. As a result, CIC was requested to reaffirm this so-called “magic wand” policy. Eagan pointed out that CIC also needs to provide correct background information for this policy. Murphy mentioned that Peoplesoft system is able to date a students’ enrollment record to incorporate the policy change.
   MSP (Seitz/Cadwallader) to approve 7-0-0.

4. Review of ANTH 3580 Middle East for Upper Division General Education D4.
   MSP (Seitz/ Fenno-Smith) to approve 7-0-0. No discussion.

   MSP (Seitz/ Fenno-Smith) to approve 7-0-0. No discussion.

   MSP (Seitz/ Wildy) to approve 7-0-0. No discussion

   MSP (Seitz/Cadwallader) to approve 7-0-0.
Discussion: Seitz mentioned to have seen this course originally in Science GE committee last year. There had been significant improvement and had been made compliant in terms of learning outcomes.

8. Review of BIOL 3065 Humans and Sex for Upper Division General Education B6
MSP (Cadwallader/ Fenno-Smith) to approve 7-0-0.

Discussion: Cadwallader first asked Murphy to clarify the format in GE document. Seitz expressed concerns about the title of BIOL 3065 and considered the course to be more about gender issues than about sexual reproduction. Cadwallader and Seitz then had discussion on the definitions of sex and gender. Wildy suspected that the term of sex in the course title is to attract student enrollment.

9. Discussion on BEC 5 and on approving online courses and to convert existing course into online format.
Seitz questioned the current procedure of converting existing course into online course format. He said that currently courses of both in-class and online formats share the same course number. Seitz questioned that if the converting existing course into online course should need course modification or new course approval. Seitz addressed that an online course should be considered as a completely different course format. As a result, an online course should be treated as a new course, rather than a course modification.

Cadwallader also addressed the question of whether online and classroom courses should have different course numbers. Cadwallader thought under certain situations, different course formats may not need different course numbers. However, it may be difficult to draw a line, especially when some courses may mix online approaches with classroom teaching.

Eagan explained that since the procedure of course classification was made in 90s’, it is difficult to provide clear guidelines for the current situation.

Bellone explained the background of class format. Cadwallader stated that creation of online courses should not be in favor of instructor’s own purpose. However, it also should not be the intention to create a bureaucratic procedure to discourage adoption of online classes.

Wildy and Seitz said that it should be meaningful for students to know about the online class format. It should be clearly indicated before passing any document approving an online class, or CIC will face complicated cases in approving online classes, such as labs.

Eagan claimed that there is need to offer online courses to attract students. Meanwhile, it will also help to use the same course number to keep compatibility. Seitz noted that the instruction format and course content should both determine a course. Cadwallader said that it should not be a problem for new courses. But for existing courses, should the online format be considered as a new course? The fact is: even when a new instructor took an existing course, some of the changes in format may be included.
Bellone said that using lab or not will be related to course change. However, using different course numbers for an online format will create great complication and may confuse students. It will also affect course equivalence with community colleges.

Wildy stated that some change in online courses may be significant enough to warrant a new course number. The bottom line is there should be clear guidelines to follow when approving an online course format.

Fenno-Smith said that different course numbers will cause major confusion. But we do need to respond creatively to avoid delay of adopting online courses.

Eagan pointed out that College and Department policies should also affect the transformation of existing courses to online formats. Cadwallader agreed with this and mentioned that if it is the nature of discipline that certain courses are suitable for online format and some not; this should be determined by the department. No department should be forced to offer courses on line. Departments and Colleges should determine their own policies.

10. Discussion of Accessible Technology Initiative and the Development of Instructional Materials Policy with Jean Wells, Information Technology Consultant and member of the ATI Planning Team, CSUEB.

Chair Eagan introduced Wells and described the background of Chancellor’s mandate for accessibility to handicap/special-aid students. Eagan also explained current practices of CSUEB’s equal accessibility to classroom and course material. After the introduction, Jean Wells made a multimedia presentation. The presentation included several interviews and stories about students who need assistance and accessibility for learning. The interviews also included response from faculty. Wells then described about what to do to ensure campus accessibility, such as changing instructional sequence, PPT format, selecting textbook, and so on, to move the campus forward. In the end of the presentation, Wells demonstrated a Text-to-Speech Software: Kurzweil 3000.

Discussion: Eagan asked about the cost of providing equal accessibility and questioned if the term “equality” would make it challenging/costly to meet students’ needs. Seitz asked if the long lead-time requirement will make the curriculum less flexible. Seitz also expressed the concern that the lead-time requirement and the lack of flexibility for instructors will make the course unable to take advantage of latest change and to accommodate students’ requests in class. AVP Bellone addressed that to establish policies to ensure textbook be ordered on time may challenge the current practice of part-time instructor assignment, which often involves last-minute decisions. The availability of electronic content in different course material may need to trade-off the academic freedom when instructors selecting their course material.

11. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 4:40pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Steve Peng