Committee on Teaching (COT)
MINUTES
February 5, 2013, 10:00-11:30 a.m., Kerr Hall 129

Present: Charlie McDowell, *Chair*, Michael Chemers, Deborah Gould, Martin Weissman, Nandini Bhattacharya (NSTF), Gabi Cruz (SUA)

Absent with notice: Kirsten Silva Gruesz, Jim Phillips, *sits with*, Director of Learning Technologies, Noelle Lehnhard (GSA)

Consent Agenda
The meeting minutes of January 22, 2013, will be reviewed at the next COT meeting.

Chair Updates
Chair McDowell informed members of a proposed bylaw change to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charge to formally include the COT Chair among the membership. The Chair of COT has been attending SEC meeting this year as a guest. Members were supportive of the SEC proposal.

Chair McDowell updated members on a report written by the Senate Committee on International Education (CIE) titled "The Parlous State of International Education at UCSC." The report raises important questions about UCSC's lack of progress in enrolling international undergraduate students. The report has been reviewed by SEC and a revised version of it will be presented to faculty at the March 8 Senate meeting.

Spring Quarter Forum on Online Education (continued)
Members had a spirited discussion about online education and the spring forum.

Membership of the Panel
Chair McDowell announced that Lois Kazakoff, Deputy Editorial Page Editor for the San Francisco Chronicle and UCSC alumna, has agreed to moderate the forum. Professor Ian Bogost, Georgia Tech, is unavailable to be on the panel.

Chair McDowell stated that he is of the opinion that COT should have a current UCSC student on the panel, and asked for advice on identifying one. The Student Union Assembly representative offered to put Chair McDowell in touch with a student organization focused on online learning.

Members agreed that there should be an administrator on the panel, and recommended that CP/EVC Galloway be contacted.

Other member recommendations include Wendy Brown (UC Berkeley), Kip Tellez (UCSC), Daphne Koller (co-founder of Coursera), and possibly an administrator associated with UC Online Education.

Proposed Questions for the Panel
- Why use online education? How might cost, quality, and efficiency, reason into this response?
- What are the benefits and consequences of using online education?
- What are student perspectives on online education? Do students prefer online courses?
- How will online education change the role of the professor?
- Who owns the rights to online courses, and who controls their distribution?
- What is the role of Teaching Assistants in online courses? Do online courses require more or less Teaching Assistants per student?
- What might happen to divisions, such as the Arts or Humanities, that have less clear uses for online education? Will offering traditional courses in these divisions become too expensive and force reductions in traditional course offerings?
- How might online education change the institutional mission of the UC, and of UCSC?
- How might online education impact diversity at UCSC? Are there good reasons to think that underrepresented students might be disproportionately affected for better or for worse?
- How is the quality of online courses assessed?
- What conversations are being foreclosed by focusing discussions somewhat exclusively on online education?
- What is the purpose of education, and is the quality of online education that the UC can provide sufficient for reaching that purpose?
- Is UC faculty time better spent teaching upper-division courses, than in teaching large lower-division courses? If so, can some of these lower-divisions course be offered as online courses?

Online Education and the UCSC Coursera Agreement
During the discussion about the third forum, the question arose of whether the UCSC Coursera Agreement had been sent to the Senate for review. Chair McDowell stated that he had heard that the administration was moving forward without Senate review due to a hard deadline that precluded the possibility for meaningful Senate review. This sparked a conversation about teaching and curriculum at UCSC, as well as shared faculty governance.

Members of COT expressed strong concern that the administration bypassed principles of shared governance by moving forward with the Coursera agreement prior to faculty consultation. Chair McDowell questioned what might specifically be in the agreement that could constrain a faculty

member from supporting it? Members stated that there are broad issues of importance to teaching, curriculum, educational policy, and budgetary concerns, that need to be vetted by Senate faculty prior to any agreement with Coursera. Further, members expressed concern that UCSC alumni, who often positively reflect on the small class experience they had at UCSC, might be opposed to UCSC offering online courses; offering courses through coursera, if it gains traction, might negatively impact UCSC's image. Moreover, members are not certain UCSC has much to gain from a partnership with Coursera, whereas Coursera may be in a position to profit from it.

Members continued to raise concerns about the partnership. Having not had the chance to review the contract details, members are unsure if there is a minimum course requirement, and of what would happen if UCSC does not reach it. Other issues arose about the quality of courses offered by Coursera, with members questioning whether courses are UC-quality. In short, members of COT voiced many concerns about the partnership with Coursera and what appears to be a lack of shared governance in moving forward with the proposal.

There was general agreement among the committee to write to the CP/EVC voicing COT's concern that the faculty has not been properly consulted with about the impending signing of the Coursera contract, a course of action that requires faculty input insofar as it concerns academic, educational, and curricular issues.

Plagiarism Software
COT reviewed the proposal from the CP/EVC to purchase a campus-wide software license to help students and faculty detect plagiarism. COT recognized that not all faculty will have a use for the software, but that the writing based disciplines might greatly benefit from it both in terms of reduction in the workload of faculty searching to uncover plagiarism, but also in terms of students learning more about what constitutes plagiarism. If campus administration and the relevant Senate committees deem the software cost effective, COT is in support of the proposal.

Excellence in Teaching Nomination Process
Members discussed proposed changes to the Excellence in Teaching Awards (ETA) nomination process. Members agreed that they will request letters of recommendation from departmental chairs, and one page statements of teaching philosophy from roughly fifteen short-listed faculty.

Members were informed of how the ETA awards ceremony has changed in recent years from being a stand alone event to being attached to the end of a Senate meeting. Although COT does not have direct purview over how the ceremony is hosted, members were of the opinion that there should be a stand alone ceremony to recognize teaching excellence, possibly combined with the Outstanding Teaching Assistant Awards.

Center for Teaching and Learning Vision Statement (continued)
Chair McDowell asked members to make a list of at least five desired services from a Center for Teaching Excellence at UCSC, and to email them to the committee analyst before the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.