California State University, East Bay
Committee on Instruction and Curriculum

Approved Minutes of Meeting of Monday, January 7, 2008

Members present: Carl Bellone, Tom Bickley, Tom Cadwallader, Jennifer Eagan, Linda Ivey, Jim Mitchell, Fung-Shine Pan, Jeff Seitz, Mitchell Watnik

Members absent: Denise Delumen-Wong, Hongwei Du

Guests: Dee Andrews, Nan Chico, Rosanne Harris

1. approval of agenda as amended MSP Seitz/Watnik 9/0/0

2. approval of minutes of 11/19/08 as amended 9/0/0

3. review of HIST courses 3123, 3150, 3302, and 3305 [agenda items 4-7] all for C4: MSP Seitz/Mitchell 9/0/0/0
   Andrews responded to questions about geographical terminology. Cadwallader, noting possible overlap among some of these courses and potential offerings in other departments, asked about the process for avoiding conflicts. Bellone responded with information about possible upcoming web solutions and improved communications. Discussion continued about cross-listing courses and related administrative matters. Prospect of using SharePoint has potential for helping in this matter.

4. Review of ES 1001 for D 1-3; MSP Cadwallader/Mitchell 9/0/0
   Committee reviewed Colleen Fong’s response to the GE Subcommittee’s concern about the oral presentation component of this course, and approved ES 1001 for D 1-3.

5. Review of HSC 3200 for B6: MSP Seitz/Ivey 8/1/0
   The initial discussion focused on prerequisites or the lack thereof for UD GE B6 courses. Concerns, expressed particularly by Watnik, focused on math skills. Watnik advocated listing LD GE requirements as prerequisites for the UD GE courses. Cadwallader expressed frustration with students in UD courses who have not, in fact, completed prerequisite requirements. Articulation agreements with community colleges seem to deal with these issues. This does not address the quality of instruction transfer students received at their former institutions. Bellone and Eagan point out that GE is intended to broaden the education of our students. Members desire better check of transfer students’ competencies.

6. Review of LAST 3000 for D4: MSP Pan/Mitchell 9/0/0/0
   Bickley wished for more explicit articulation of the information literacy component of the course. Watnik wished for more explicit articulation of the data analysis aspects of the coursework.
7. Eagan raised the matter of electronically sharing documents for committee review rather than generating so much paper, most of which is destined for the recycle bin. Seitz objects to going to all electronic distribution at this point, as the resources for printing them individually then comes from department budgets. Ivey suggested that members who wish to deal with electronic copies do so, i.e., by opting out of paper distribution.

8. Amendment of Article V: MSP Cadwallader/Seitz 9/0/0 Changes to the CIC bylaws, guided by Eagan: 1. Clean-up: replace ALSS with CLASS and make uniform reference to COS; 2. Strike section on the non-existent Subcommittee of Lifelong Understanding in G.E. Requirement section; 3. Replace “Director of MATS” with “Director of Online and Hybrid Instruction” as the appropriate standing member of the Technology and Instruction Subcommittee.

9. Change of CIC meeting time from 2:40-4:50 to 2-3:50 was discussed, so that the meeting would not overlap two teaching modules. The coexistence of new and old course meeting times argues against making that change now. We’ll discuss this later as the schedule becomes clearer.

10. Continuing discussion of the Online and Hybrid Policy Discussion: Members discussed definitions of “hybrid” vs “online” so that CIC can know which courses need to be examined under this policy. Nan Chico and Carl Bellone helped the committee understand that hybrid courses require some face-to-face component, i.e., seat time at a CSUEB campus. Seitz clarified that a course using online components but in which the seat-time is not lessened (or replaced by online time) is not a hybrid course. Such web-enhanced courses do not require further CIC review. Courses in which some seat-time/face-to-face time is replaced by planned online time are hybrid. The distribution of the time can vary without changing the definition of the course. Seitz advocates that College curriculum committees bear the responsibility for approving the ratio of online/face-to-face in hybrid courses. Cadwallader notes that the College level committees will work out the process they choose. Watnik points out that classroom scheduling will drive the determination of that ratio. Bellone suggests a range, e.g., 50-80% will be online for a course to be “hybrid.” Upon further reflection, Ivey agreed with Seitz. The committee tabled the discussion, and next meeting will address matters of evaluation form, student research support module for BlackBoard, and define the oral component for online courses for GE requirements.

11. Adjournment: 4:50 pm MSP Eagan/Bickley 9/0/0

-respectfully submitted, -Tom Bickley