

**Committee on Educational Policy
Minutes
Wednesday, November 14, 2012
Kerr Hall Room 307, 11 a.m.-1:30 p.m.**

Present: Mark Anderson, Lora Bartlett, Max Hufft, (SUA Rep.), Pam Hunt-Carter (Registrar, *ex-officio*), Olof Einarsson, Tracy Larrabee (Chair), Ronnie Lipschutz (Provost Rep.), Stephen Sweat (NSTF Rep.), James Wilson, Susanna Wrangell (Staff), and Jim Zachos.

Absent: Ted Warburton.

Guests: Cher Bergeon (Academic Preceptor Designee), Margie Claxton (Associate Registrar), Richard Hughey (VPDUE), Barbara Love (Articulation Officer), Michael McCawley (Director of Admissions).

Executive Session

Chair Larrabee updated members on the task force on Academic Structures. CEP will co-sponsor the forum on Online Education with the Committee on Teaching (COT). This forum will be the first in a series to address all concerns with online teaching, development, hybrids and infrastructure.

I. Announcements and Updates:

Chair Larrabee updated the guests on the jointly sponsored forum on Online Education, to be in place of the Senate Meeting on Wednesday, November 28, 2012 at the Stevenson Event Center, time TBA. The Senate is hoping to stream the event or at least have it recorded for future referencing. An example of an excellent online program is called "Open University" from England. Member Bartlett will email a link to members. Online education has been done for profit, quickly and not necessarily for quality. Some TAs used Google Forum when there was a strike on campus so the section could still meet and the students found this to be very useful. These online courses are not going to take our students away, some online courses are not designed to be a huge impact on our enrollments. Chair Larrabee updated members on the Engineering students disqualification appeals. These have been successfully handled, no junior or senior will be disqualified and the advisers in Engineering found the recent forum for advisers helpful.

Chair Larrabee pulled one of the petitions off the consent agenda. CEP is receiving many petitions for substitutions of the new general education requirements, many of these requests, the course either does not meet the requirement or the department does not want to sponsor for the requested GE designation. CEP will be sending out notification to advising that these types of petitions will not be accepted or considered. CEP will work with departments that still have pending GE course approvals to address capacity issues. If the course does focus on educational outcomes, and stratifies the specific learning objective for the GE designation, then the department should submit a revised course approval form.

Enrollment management is also an issue that was discussed briefly by members. Computer Engineering is among departments that are thinking about using a pre-major. This benefits the students as the departments can advise students as soon as possible. Pre-majors have been retired for some time, so Chair Larrabee will work with the department's adviser to make a seamless process for admissions staff and students, this solution may not work for the whole campus.

II. External Review follow up if needed

Chair Larrabee asked members to comment on and approve the draft supplemental letters for Art and Philosophy. Members approved both letters.

III. Catalog Language Update Concerning Repeating of Classes for a Third Time

Last year CEP members thought about updating language in the catalog with the approval of legislative changes to SCR 9.1.8. Members discussed the draft language and assigned a new draft to Members Einarsdottir, Provost Rep. Lipshutz, and SUA Rep. Hufft to be reviewed at our November 28 meeting.

IV. Pre Consultation for Jim Phillips, Director of Instructional Technology Group

From our meeting of October 31 members held a discussion about on-line education. For the consultation members would like to discuss: on-line course development, capacity issues and advertising with regards to eCommons. Director Phillips will be at our November 28 meeting just before our forum on online education.

Here are the questions for our consultation:

- If a professor came to your department now saying he or she was designing an online course, what resources can you offer him or her with respect to course design? How many such could you offer at the same time? What resource obstacles could you foresee? What obstacles might professors find on interacting with your department? What is the learning curve for designing online materials, as you see it?
- If a professor came to your department now saying he or she had designed an online course and wanted to talk to you about how you could assist in the course offering, what resources could you suggest to him or her? In particular, can your unit provide support for online discussion sections, video conferencing (beyond that available with Skype) or course streaming?
- Do any of these answers change if it is what Ira Pohl is calling a hybrid online course?
- Are the resources of your department documented online? If so, should they be advertised better, or might that “kill your department with success”?
- Which of the models of support you can offer are available without recharge, and which are available only with recharge?
- What is the best learning management tool we have? Must all professors use the same learning management system? We hear rumors that UCOE might be looking at Canvas. How will that fit with our existing systems?

V. Course Objectives and Guidelines form VPAA Lee

CEP members reviewed the draft documents for departments to reference in preparation for the campus WASC reviewers. In the departmental letter members agreed components of the draft request needed clarification.

- What exactly should the departments post initially? This is not obvious in the letter.
- The attached matrix chart is confusing in design. It is not immediately clear what the column headings (letters) represent? Specific learning outcomes from the first table? Does one size fit all, or is there flexibility for modifying the table?
- As there are only 4 questions for departments to consider, these should also be placed within the body of the request letter.
- Is the Academic Affairs link to the pilot program examples suppose to be active? If so, where is it?
- What is the proposed due date?

Member Zachos will write the draft and Analyst Wrangell will invite VPAA Lee to our November 28 meeting for a consultation.

CEP would like to emphasize to departments that learning objectives are what they are currently doing, this just needs to be articulated. CEP does not want departments to “reinvent the wheel” the objectives must be explicit, what the faculty agree upon for each discipline; such as the goals for your students, what skills do the graduates master? Which courses support these objectives and what is the departmental outcome? For example,

“Please write down the objectives, skills, or goals, that your department has identified for your students, what are these?”

The learning outcomes, objectives, for example; to write competently and coherently in the area of study (discipline).”

CEP members held a brief discussion on the course approval forms and how to update. Graduate Council only added questions to their supplemental form. CEP members need to understand their role in evaluating the objective on the form. Every course must have one core topic that relates to a learning outcome. CEP does not vet the course content. The course approval form must be tailored to meet these fundamental questions, departments need to answer the question with the learning objective and it will be important for departments to have samples that are easily referenced, like at a website. CEP will continue the discussion on changing or modifying the form, or creating a pilot template.

SUA Request for Course Syllabi added to Student Portal moved forward due to lack of time.

Committee on Educational Policy 2012 - 13