Committee on Courses of Instruction  
Igor Mitrovic, MD, Chair  

Wednesday, December 14, 2016  
10:00 am - 12:00pm  
Room N-417  

MINUTES  


PRESENT:       Igor Mitrovic (Chair), Jaekyu Shin (Vice Chair), Annette Carley, Douglas Carlson, Melinda Cuthbert, Maya Vijayaraghavan, Lisa Winston  

ABSENT:         Jeffrey Lansman, Michael McMaster, Barbara Panning  

GUESTS:         Jeff Harter, Associate Registrar; George Michael, Academic Senate Office Programmer; Paula Peters, Academic Senate Office Coordinator  

Chair Igor Mitrovic called the meeting to order at 10:15am. A quorum was present.  

Chair's Report  

Chair Igor Mitrovic provided the following report from the most recent Executive Council meeting:  

- **Campus Fundraising:** At the last Division meeting in October, Division Chair Ruth Greenblatt noted the perception that a significant amount of fundraising revenue is going to the development of new buildings and not to people. The Chancellor responded that in fact most of the funds raised through philanthropy has gone to support faculty, students and programs. At the last Executive Council meeting, Chair Greenblatt informed the group that the Academic Senate is still waiting for more information on which programs have been supported.  

- **Chan Zuckerberg BioHub:** The Council met with Joe DeRisi, co-director of the Chan Zuckerberg BioHub, to discuss the future criteria and eligibility requirements for the program. In particular, members expressed interest in having faculty from all series eligible to apply.  

- **Chancellor’s Fund:** The budget for the 2017 Chancellors Fund has been approved. New this
year is funding for an internal Academic Senate Office Communications Analyst position. This new position will be separate from the UCSF public affairs office and will be focusing solely on faculty. Along with the new analyst position, $40,000 has been allocated for faculty leadership training; $95,000 has been allocated for Open Access publishing support; and an allocation of $16,000 to increase the amount of funding for travel grants.

**Numbering Course Objectives**

Chair Mitrovic informed the committee that he would like to have a discussion on potentially having an explicit requirement that course objectives be numbered. He noted that it is much easier to review a course when the objectives are numbered. Committee members discussed whether or not to make it a requirement for course preparers to number objectives within the Course Review system. After discussion members decided to make numbering optional to ensure flexibility in formatting and to reduce errors on the course forms. Academic Senate Programmer George Michaels was asked to add the optional function to the system.

**Report on Late Course Submissions**

Associate Registrar Jeff Harter reported to the committee on the issue of late course submissions. He informed the group that prior to the spring term of 2010, COCOI had a firm deadline for the submission of course forms. Exceptions were made for late submissions, but there were usually very few of them. Simultaneous with the roll-out of the Senate Course Review System, the Committee, in consultation with the Office of the Registrar, created separate deadlines for minor/inactivation forms versus new/major/reactivation forms. New/major/reactivation forms were given a deadline that was 10 to 12 weeks prior to the start of the term, but minor changes could now be submitted through the final week of an active term.

The goal in extending the deadline for minor forms was to make instructor corrections easier if changes were needed after the term began. The system also allowed new and major forms to be submitted after the deadline, provided approval could be obtained from the Chair of the Committee on Courses of Instruction.

The most recent terms show a trend toward late submissions for all types of forms. Changes made to courses after study list filing has begun require manual intervention by Student Information programmers to synchronize Course Catalog updates with the Schedule of Classes and with course rosters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Late (after New/Major Deadline - Jul. 10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inactivate: 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor: 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Major/React: 59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New:  20    3
Total:  228  106  46%

WI16    Total    Late (after New/Major Deadline - Oct. 6)
Inactivate:  11  10
Minor:  110  72
Major/React:  24  8
New:  18  5
Total:  163  95  58%

SP16    Total    Late (after New/Major Deadline - Dec.18)
Inactivate:  18  16
Minor:  65  51
Major/React:  41  18
New:  20  4
Total:  144  89  62%

ST16    Total    Late (after New/Major Deadline - Apr.8)
Inactivate:  13  13
Minor:  74  58
Major:  8  4
New:  12  2
Total:  107  77  72%
Committee member discussed and agreed that the best way to address the recent trend in late course submissions is to increase communication with the schools, faculty, and course preparers. Associate Registrar Jeff Harter will construct two communications about meeting the deadlines, one for instructor of records who have been late and one for those who have not been late. Chair Mitrovic will reach out to the EPC (Educational Policy Committees) about it for follow up with these instructors. The other action item is for Academic Senate Analyst Artemio Cardenas and Academic Senate Programmer George Michaels to create an automated reminder to go out to instructors three to four weeks before the deadline.

**Follow Up on Interprofessional Course Language**

Committee members agreed to table this item to the next meeting.

**Online Courses**

In October, Chair Mitrovic informed the committee that some members had encountered a course form which indicated both web-based and seminar work, but the course only had web-based instruction. The question was asked whether a course with all web-based instruction should receive the same calculation of hours as a course that has traditional face-to-face instruction? After further discussion, committee members agreed that a review of web-based course instruction should be added to the committee agenda for the year and that a review should be done on all the related Academic Senate policies at the systemwide level and at the other campuses. The goal will be to determine whether there should be separate designation for web-based work.

To follow up on the request for review, Analyst Cardenas informed the Committee that through 2009-2011, the UC Academic Senate spent a significant portion of time on reviewing online education policies. In 2010, a taskforce report was developed and policies for undergraduate instruction were issued for systemwide review. In 2011, documents relating to an online education pilot for undergraduate courses was released. Based on archived records, the UCSF
Education Policy Committee and COCOI groups decided not to comment on any of the systemwide reports or policies. The reasoning was because the policies mainly regarded undergraduate education. To assist the committee in the discussion over how to handle online Analyst Cardenas then pointed to the systemwide Academic Senate report on Remote and Online Instruction at the University California - http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/HP_MGYreRpt_Spec_Cte_Online_Remote _Instruction_FINAL.pdf. Within this report, there is a list of supplemental points that faculty at UCSF could consider with reviewing proposed new courses and programs with a significant component of remote or online instruction. Committee members reviewed the list and agreed that the following questions should be listed on the course review form for courses with online content:

- Does the faculty proponent have the appropriate expertise for the proposed mode of delivery, and is there an appropriate means to train faculty not familiar with the particular form of delivery being proposed?

- Is the rationale for selecting the primary mode of instruction and the primary instructional materials clear and compelling?

- Are the standards of the proposed instruction and evaluation commensurate with traditional instruction? Are expectations for students’ performance equivalent to those for students pursuing traditional or physically resident study?

- Are the proposed modes of assessment both fair and unlikely to be compromised by academic dishonesty?

- Have appropriate modes of student/instructor interaction been identified, and are they likely to be successful? This consideration should include the role of teaching assistants, if applicable.

- Have appropriate modes of peer-to-peer interaction been identified, and are they likely to be successful?

- Is adequate technical support available for both students and faculty? Is the level of accessibility of required technology great enough to avoid disadvantaging those with lesser means?

- Does the proposal fully recognize the amount of faculty time that will be required to develop, train for, and deliver the proposed course or program of instruction?

Each question will be added to the course form website page with a yes or no check box. Members agreed that the COCOI group will not able to evaluate some of the questions, but instead hopes that other reviewers in the course review process will be able to determine. Furthermore, asking the course preparers the online specific questions will help to challenge them to meet the requirements when developing their course.
New Business

Academic Senate Programmer George Michaels informed the committee that he would like to develop a web API (Application Program Interface) that provides a secure, online data interface to share UCSF Course Data. Each school’s programmer can use the API to create a direct connection to a group of selected courses. After setup, the courses will dynamically update whenever the Course Catalog is updated requiring no additional maintenance.

PharmD Core Curriculum example

http://pharmd.ucsf.edu/curriculum/core

This is SOP PharmD Degree Program courses. Each course listed has a link to the course catalog’s course. Instead of linking to the course catalog, with an API, the programmer can import the course data into their webpage. The PharmD Degree Program core curriculum can then list just the course data for each course that they choose.

Proposal to the Committee

Approximately $2,100.00 will be needed to develop the API with 1 month development time. COCOI members voted to support the proposal and the amount. A request will now be submitted to the Academic Senate Office for review and approval.

Old Business

None