Committee on Educational Policy
Peter Loomer, PhD, Chair

MINUTES
Wednesday, April 13, 2011

PRESENT: Peter Loomer (Chair), Abbey Alkon (Vice Chair), Tamara Alliston, Tina Brock, Lucy Fisher, Thomas Kearney, Nancy Nkanseh, Doug Schmucker, Sophia Saeed, Vineeta Singh

ABSENT: Harry Hollander, Judy Martin-Holland, Elisabeth Wilson

GUEST: Joe Castro, Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Affair; Karen Butter, UCSF Librarian; Jeff Harter, Associate Registrar

The Committee on Educational Policy was called to order by Chair Loomer on April 13 at 3:36 p.m. in room S-616D. A quorum was present.

The minutes from March 9, 2011 were approved.

Chair's Report
Chair Loomer provided the following updates:

Monday, April 25 is "Medical Education Day" with a focus on interprofessional/interdepartmental education.

There was no Executive Committee meeting in April.

Systemwide UCEP matters included:

1. Online Education. There is a pilot program starting through UCOP. Twelve different proposals were developed; these are throughout the UC campuses although none are at UCSF. All are being tested to see the best option. Right now, UCOP is targeting courses not programs. It's open only to UC students. Further information will follow.

2. Student Residency. The Systemwide Rules & Jurisdiction committee has ruled that no face-to-face time is required for residency to be established.

3. Student Privacy Policy was created to prohibit filming of “private” matters. The question arose as to what was defined as “private”—do you consider a classroom private or public? If a student asks a question in a classroom, is that considered private and thus protected? Does this affect Content Capture and will it mean students not asking questions if they know they're being recorded?

4. Intercampus courses. The Registrar representative at the UCEP meeting said there is difficulty in taking such courses from a registration/logistics viewpoint. This ongoing discussion affects both undergraduate and some graduate programs.
Discussion of Potential UCSF Library Conversion to Academic Commons – Joe Castro, Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Affairs, and Karen Butter, UCSF Librarian

Joe Castro and Karen Butter discussed an initiative still in development to transform part of the Parnassus Library into an Academic Commons. Discussions are being had with technology companies and UCOP among others. A proposal will be presented to the Chancellors’ Cabinet in June 2011.

As currently envisioned, it would include altering the space to include:
1. Collaborative Learning: Group study, interactive tech and media, web-conferencing.
2. Classrooms: Teaching and learning, faculty development, small groups, library services.
3. Research & Scholarship: Data management tools, search experts, digital resources, library materials.
4. Technology Café: computer labs, tech commons, multi-media labs, library services.
5. Community Center: Meeting center, reception, professional events, exhibits (art, etc.)
6. Individual Study: Quiet, carrels, table, and other pathways. Also, is individual study still important, or is it all collaborative for students?

Discussion: What do CEP members see as falling into this space?

Members discussed:
1. Enlarging the Kanbar Center.
2. Dedicating a room to “gesture learning technology” and/or for testing new technology.
3. Maintaining quiet individual study space.
4. Expanding technology such that faculty can simulcast to any classroom throughout the campus.
5. Developing “Champions” within each school for ID/IP education. Each Dean is being asked to select such faculty.
6. Promoting the design of the TLC to other universities, that is, being our own champion?
7. Resolving the issue of having faculty “cross the street” to teach courses. Jeff Harter, Associate Registrar, raised the issue that many faculty do not like being away from their school or the Medical Center and are resistant to teaching courses outside of their building.
   a. Technology can dissolve this issue if faculty can teach via their own office to a multitude of different small rooms via Skype, etc.

Discussion of Interprofessional and Interdisciplinary Course Logistics – Jeff Harter, Associate Registrar

OUTCOME: If needed, CEP will develop a policy that defines what type of course is ID/IP and how it is to be reviewed and by what body. Analyst Cleaver will coordinate.

Chair Loomer provided background on the situation. Jeff Harter, Associate Registrar, relayed that there already exists within the system an IDS for courses with multiple departments (all within the same school). A lot of them are core courses. The Registrar is set up to handle the registration by faculty and students of Interdisciplinary courses, but it's never been used.

For new courses fitting inside of the category of “interprofessional”, a new ten-character course title could be created designating courses which fit into this category, i.e. INTERPROF, for example.

Gail Persily of the Library said there are some implications for CLE. Right now, courses are either in a school or they are in ID/IP. Per the Registrar, it doesn't have a significant impact where the course is put - but it may serve a purpose down the road if ID/IP is the pursued avenue for the campus as a whole.

CEP members proposed that:
1. ID/IP courses be listed twice—in both schools—within the Registrar.
2. By listing ID/IP courses within the Registrar as INTERPROF, it will then appear on the transcript as such.
3. Modifying the workflow of ID/IP Courses such that they are seen by both school’s EP Committee. However, if it is an issue of course or FTE ownership, then perhaps COCI should review such courses at a live meeting rather than online.

4. Separately, perhaps a new subcommittee should be created to review ID/IP courses? Perhaps this is something that can ultimately be handled by the new Center for Excellence which will be focused on ID/IP Education?

**Senate Overview: COCI**
Heather Alden raised questions regarding the Standing Orders of the Regents 105.1, which details that the Senate doesn’t have authority to review courses.

1. If courses are already being reviewed by schools, then why does the Senate need to redo—and does it have the authority to do so?
2. And--where does that leave ID/IP courses which are the future of UCSF education? And who is to lead the charge? COCI and-or CEP?

CEP member Alkon said COCI served a purpose to require each school to create an EPC and to meet a standard, and to have an outside person review the course. COCI also keeps the courses uniform and focused. Member Alkon commented that the oversight provided by COCI is extremely valuable.

Separately, SOP EPC Chair Brock raised the question of UCSF standard definitions of seminar, conference, course, class, and other such terms. She proposed that some committee—COCI or CEP—come up with standard definitions so as to assist faculty in assigning the right terminology, and the right Course Form paperwork. Senate Executive Director Heather Alden stated that such definitions were created some fifteen years ago. The Senate office will try to track these down and see if they need to be updated.

**Updates from the schools**
Postponed due to lack of time.

**Update from the Library**
None.

**Old Business**
None.

**New Business**
None.

Chair Loomer adjourned the meeting at 5:05 p.m.