

COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY, EQUITY, & INCLUSION

April 16, 2026

To: Kenneth Barish, Chair
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Esra Kurum, Chair 
Committee on Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion

Re: [Campus Review] (Proposal) 2nd Round - Master of Science in Data-Driven Marketing & AI Application (MDM-AA) – formerly M.S. in Data Driven Marketing & AI Application (MSDM-AA)-SSGDP

The Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CODEI) has reviewed the second round proposal for the (MSDM-AA)-SSGDP. While the revised proposal makes a positive step by explicitly acknowledging the importance of diversity, equity, inclusion, and responsible AI, from a DEI perspective the committee continues to see two related concerns: (1) the integration of ethical AI and (2) the consistency of student preparation in AI applications.

First, the proposal now identifies learning outcomes related to ethical AI, including bias, fairness, privacy, and governance, and states that these outcomes will be reflected in course syllabi and assessment rubrics where applicable. This is a meaningful improvement. However, it remains unclear how these learning outcomes will be systematically required, coordinated, and assessed across the curriculum at the program level. In particular, it is not evident how all students, regardless of elective choices or course variation, will receive consistent and comprehensive preparation in the ethical implications of AI applications in marketing. Given the program's emphasis on AI, a more explicit and structured integration of ethical AI into the core curriculum would strengthen both the academic rigor and alignment with the committee's recommendations.

Second, while the proposal notes that AI applications are incorporated into existing courses, stating that faculty "routinely incorporate AI-enabled tools, cases, and assignments," the extent and consistency of this integration remain unclear. The description suggests that AI exposure is broadly embedded, with deeper engagement occurring primarily through electives, but it does not specify the level of AI-related content across courses. As a result, from a DEI perspective, it remains unclear what level of AI-related competency is guaranteed for all students and how consistently this preparation will be delivered across the curriculum. Clarifying these expectations would strengthen transparency and help ensure that all students receive a coherent and well-defined level of preparation in both AI applications and their ethical implications.