Members present: Eileen Barrett, Andrew Carlos, Brian Cook, Cristian Gaedicke, Sue Opp, Nancy Thompson, Claudia Uhde-Stone (Secretary), Jing Wen Yang, Mitchell, Watnik (Chair).

Members absent: Jennifer Eagan, Jim Mitchell,

Guests: Sarah Aubert, Keri O’Neal, Glen Perry, Angela Schneider, Farzad Shahbodaghoul, Jason Singley, Roger Wen,

1. Approval of the agenda
MSP Thompson, Andrew

MSP Barret, Thompson
Move Human Development issue up to earlier time, if time permits

2. Approval of the minutes of 2015Jan05
MSP Opp, Gaedicke,

3. Reports
a. Report of the Chair
GE committee will have to move weekly

4. Old Business

Revised policy for Online & Hybrid Instruction (amended by Senate and referred back to committee for consideration on 1/13/15)

Director of online campus, Dr. Roger Wen explained suggested online & hybrid course modifications.

Opp: concerned about changes in course modification form; particularly point 5. Comments that it would not be practical to assume that every instructor who would teach online will go through the “QOLT Rubric” training. Alternatives: thoughtful self-monitoring, monitoring of non TT faculty.

Barrett: agrees that suggested modifications from point 5 may fit better under point 4. Training can be suggested to departments, rather than be mandatory.

MSP Barrett, Opp
Move suggested language from point 5 to point 4 and modify: Instructors who teach online/hybrid courses may be requested by department to complete QQLT rubric training.

Eagan (absent), via e-mail:
I'm not going to be at our meeting today because the GE subcommittee will be meeting concurrently. But, I have a few suggestions on the online and hybrid policy document should anyone want to take them up. I am working from the draft with Roger Wen's edits, which may or may not carry the day.

"A. 1. Online instruction courses and programs shall provide an opportunity for interaction between students and the faculty member responsible for the course section, so that students can receive prompt responses to their questions. Faculty should respond to student queries and requests in a timely manner as specified in the syllabus. Faculty are also required to hold “virtual” office hours (via the technological tools appropriate to the course as a part of their instructional responsibilities); these virtual office hours may be concurrent with face-to-face office hours."

My suggestion is in bold above. I think that dropping the two days is fine, but I think that instructor should give some sense of how they would define "timely manner" in the syllabus, but that we don't need to define it. As a former department chair, I think would minimize the disputes, and if a student doesn't find the terms of the class acceptable, then that student could drop.

A. 3. Only GE SLOs are mandated to be part of a syllabus by policy, this is too broad and would demand more of an online class than we do of an on ground. Also, Julie Glass' frequent point, some of us may not call them SLOs because we find the jargon off-putting and no student-friendly. I would move to strike A. 3 and rely on other documents to dictate when and how SLOS are communicated. I hope this doesn't contain the presumption that online courses are less rigorous. Also, B. 5. says almost the same thing in a less objectionable way.

Opp, comment: Not only GE SLOs are mandated to be part of a syllabus by policy.

A. 5. "Student Services" is vague. Add "technical" consistent with the rest of the document?

A. 5 and 6. A case seems to be being made here for increased resources? I'm not opposed, but I'm not sure if it belongs in this document.
A. 7. I can't quite figure out what this means, and I don't think this document should be so dictatorial to departments who offer the programs. I think that we always assume that department are basing their offerings on (how would be prove otherwise, and what would be the stick?). I think this contains a false assumption.  
*I would move to strike A. 7*

B. 14: What's the stick and why specify TT faculty? New faculty, including lecturers are often more proficient with the technologies. I would be much more concerned with how departments evaluate and hire folks to teach online. Good policy should have clear policies, or else just state it as an aspiration to get TT faculty involved in online.

CIC going through document
I. ✓
II. ✓

IIIa.
*Explanation: Senate rejected 24-hour turn-around time*
Jen’s (e-mail) suggestion: Faculty should respond to student queries and requests in a timely manner **as specified in the syllabus.**
Thompson: in that case, do we need to change the syllabus policy to mandate that turn-around time is specified?
Carlos: specified in B11, i

Pertaining office hours, CIC suggests change:
“Personal and virtual office hours can be concurrent, provided that the total number of office hours required by the policy is met.”

5. New Business:

a. Request for revision of Engineering’s Construction Management BS Major

MSP Gaedicke, Barrett
Support double counting certain Engineering’s Construction Management BS Major units for GE Social Science (lower division area D)
Action request: need to develop cover page to indicate this

Background:
Request to double-count some Engineering’s Construction Management BS Major units for GE Social Science (lower division area D), to stay under 108 units for this Major.
Opp: Similar request was approved for engineering, allowed students to double count 8 units area D GE
b. HDEV 2001 application for GE area D1-3, passed by GE subcommittee on 1/12/15

Barret: good course, but concerned that course is large (about 100 students); much larger than the suggested class size for online course (around 20-30 students).

Keri O’Neal responds: new contract will add 2 WTUs for classes 90-119, classes over 119 will get 2 additional WTUs, starting Spring 2015 for CBE.

MSP Barrett, Thompson
Support GE approval. Note: committee cover page should indicate that we are concerned about large class size, but approve as long as instructors get additional 2 WTUs for classes 90-119.

c. Curriculum software demonstration
Conference call with representative from “Digital architecture”, with the purpose for CIC to give feedback

2 main software products:
catalogue (ACALOG) management and curriculum (CURRICULOG) management
Software demonstration of curriculog:
System integrates feedback from clients, very flexible, allows all processes online, rather than on paper, keep track of all steps.

Question: does Curriculog it integrate with Acalog?
Answer: yes, can pull data from catalogue; once a course is approved, it can be moved into working catalogue

Question: Semester conversion: can old courses be imported, modified to semester information, rather than putting all courses in from scratch
Answer: yes

Q: How long will it take to implement?
A: usually Acalog training first, then Curriculog training, together about 22 weeks

Opp: the point for this demonstration is to get feedback from CIC

Feedback from CIC:
Overall, positive feedback:
“looks brilliant”
“yes, go for it”
“with semester conversion coming, it seems urgent”
Questions: Are other systems available?
A: yes, looked at other systems, but this has more features, shorter implementation time, positive feedback,
Cost not yet known, but alternative would be hiring several people, which would probably be more costly

Anybody against it?
Jing Wen Yang: not against, but wonders if it is worth the cost.
Gaedicke: can somebody from IT check it out?
A: yes, IT will be involved while moving forward.

6. Adjournment
MSP Thompson, Carlos

Respectfully submitted,
Claudia Uhde-Stone
2015, Feb 02