

Committee on Teaching (COT)
MINUTES
April 22, 2014, 10:00 – 11:30 a.m.

Present: Charlie McDowell, *Chair*, Maria-Elena Diaz, Matthew McCarthy, Jim Phillips, *sits with*, Kirsten Silva-Gruesz, Anjali Dutt (Graduate Student Rep.), Mary-Beth Harhen (ASO staff), Suzanne Millward (ASO staff)

Absent with Notice: Michael Chemers

Routine Announcements:

There was a correction to the draft minutes of April 8, 2014 concerning faculty involvement with testing a Learning Management System (LMS); CCT would like to do a pilot of Canvas. With that, the minutes were approved.

Director Phillips will send out the LMS survey on April 30 and will leave it open for two weeks. The information that is collected from the survey will be shared with COT. He requested COT do the outreach for this. VPDUE Hughey can send out the initial call, and then COT could follow up with faculty, reminding them to participate. Director Phillips is hoping to put together a small contingency of faculty members to work on selection of a new system.

Forum Lightning Talks – April 23, 2014:

The committee completed final preparation for the “So you think your lecture course is better than a MOOC?” forum.

Excellence in Teaching Awards:

The committee determined how they would conduct the adjudication of the ETA nominations. COT members will receive a spreadsheet to record their rankings for their top six choices. By separately ranking the nominations, members will not be swayed by anyone else’s vote. For this round, the most weight should be put on teaching statements and support letters from department chairs.

COT noted that there is a possible flaw in their process because each year adjudications are treated separately from other years. Members considered whether it would be advantageous to know who gets nominated every year, especially who is in the runner-up category. In order to help make a final decision, and because the committee has a lot of turnover in membership each year, it was suggested that the process be changed for next year to include a list of who was also nominated in the years prior.

Campus Online Education Course Agreement

The agreement of developing an on-line course through ILTI requires an instructor make a formal agreement with UCOP, which is also approved by the department chair, although that approval does not appear on the form. One requirement for this is that the online course must be offered six times in three years. COT is concerned that tying up faculty resources places constraints on departments to do their own curricular and leave planning. This problem is

exaggerated in small departments with few faculty. If lecturers develop their own online course, they get a guaranteed teaching assignment for three years. Another odd situation is that the instructor is not committed to teaching the course and has the right to refuse to teach, however the department is committed to teaching the online course.

There are some questions that should be asked: Will lecturers be treated like faculty? Will the development and teaching of online courses negatively solidify a faculty member's teaching load for three years? Who owns the course after the three years have passed? How will the university be making money on online courses? Is there a practice or policy about where to target these courses by department? In terms of teaching load, are these courses considered full or partial? Do live lectures versus pre-recorded lectures affect the consideration of full or partial?

In 1.1.3, it is unclear whether the royalty fees are perpetual or for the duration of the agreement. The language is unclear, and the process should be more transparent. COT would really like to know what happens after three years.

Presidential Policy on Copyright and Fair Use

Changes in law, technology, and academic practices have led to the proposed revisions to the 1986 policy on Copyright and Fair Use. Technological advancement has created lots of grey areas about what is and is not available for course materials under fair use. For instance, Chair McDowell wants to make screen captures openly available to his students; however, he might be using copyrighted material as part of his lecture.

Director Phillips noted that UC Berkeley puts all lecture webcasts behind Sakai or other Learning Management Systems, so these resources are at least password protected. UCSC has yet to require these resources be put behind a LMS, but this is surely something Learning Technologies can do if faculty are so inclined.

COT notes that the new policy has taken a broader interpretation of applicable policies that give faculty the greatest leeway on understanding fair use. COT finds this appropriate. The web site gives a lot of relevant information and will serve as a good resource to faculty as they make decisions about the use of materials in the classroom. There are a lot of rapid changes happening in the realm of copyright now, so creating this web site with clear guidelines will make it easier for faculty to put together course materials.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m.