Committee on Educational Policy
2012-13

Issues carried over from 2011-12 and those proposed by the committee members for discussion during 2012-13:

- Online education in-service for faculty, faculty development for online courses
- Policies for submitting online or hybrid courses to COCI
- Faculty credit for teaching interprofessional courses as per CAP and promotion. For non-FOR, how is this viewed for non-instructor of record toward their teaching responsibility?
- Masters and self-sustaining courses fees
- The Course Review approval process
- Course and Clerkship evaluation forms/processes
- Reference systems available for campus-wide use
- MOUs to amend the review processes and role of various UCSF systems
- Letter of Concurrence to COCOI on units earned for course participation only
- Non-FTE endowment (bridge-funding)
- Interprofessional Programs Compliance issues
- Academic and Social support for students
- Student Conduct Policy

On-Line Education, Faculty Development

Vice Chancellor Castro presented an update on the innovations in education underscoring the Chancellor’s Educational Goals to attract and support the most talented and diverse trainees in the health sciences. He noted that the issue of faculty development in the use of educational technology, a major concern for the Committee on Educational Policy, has been fully funded for a three-year initiative.

The three methods of on-line education and the benefits of each were discussed:

1. Course, Certificates and Degree Programs – Self-supporting
2. Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) – Possible source of revenue
3. Online Training Platform – CTSI

Educational Technology Faculty Development

Gail Persily is co-chairing an operations committee with Pat O’Sullivan to plan the activities. A faculty advisory group has also been created that includes faculty from all of the schools. First order of business for this initiative is the Translational Learning Center. (TLC)

Student Support – Renee Navarro, Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Outreach

Vice Chancellor Navarro discussed her role in UCSF’s Task Force on Students Experiencing Academic Difficulties (SEAD), which is committed to strengthening diversity and outreach as well as her roll in all aspects of student support to help those with academic difficulty navigate through the UCSF process and avoid lengthy student dismissals. The Task Force has created four working groups, Anticipation and Early Identification, Due Process, Remediation Strategies and Leave of Absence, and Secondary issues. The committee discussed the need for clear and concise procedures for both students and faculty. A draft recommendation is scheduled for presentation to Joe Castro in January 2013.

While serving the challenges for underrepresented students, UCSF is looking for an expert on the issues and has discussed this need with several people outside UCSF. SEAD - Renee Navarro.pdf
Supporting and Advancing Teaching at UCSF – Helen Loeser, Director of the Academy of Medical Educators, Cynthia Ashe, Manager of the Academy of Medical Educators
Helen Loeser was invited to describe the Academy of Medical Educator’s (AME) activities in the School of Medicine and discuss potential replication or sharing of its most effective components by and with other schools at UCSF, based on interest or need. The AME was established in 2000 as part of a focused effort to revitalize the SOM teaching mission in parallel with and supportive of a concurrent curriculum reform initiative. Its mission is to support and advance the teaching mission of the UCSF SOM and the people who carry it out, with specific goals to enhance the status of teachers; promote and reward teaching excellence; foster curricular innovation; and encourage scholarship in medical education.

Discussion focused on:
- Joint advocacy for the use of the Educator’s Portfolio in advancement and promotion processes.
- Faculty development, including the Academy’s Teaching Observation Program (TOP), for which an on-line training module is being developed; educational technology workshops offered by the library; and key educational skills workshops offered by SOM’s Research and Development in Medical Education (RaDME).
- The AME’s Innovations Funding intramural grants program.
- Joint Interprofessional Funding (AME and IPE) – Call in early September, 2013.

Units of Credit without Assessment/Time Spent and Online Units
Chair Promes asked the committee to weigh in the subject of units.
In a letter dated September 14, 2012, then-Committee on Courses of Instruction Chair, Tony Hunt, Committee on Courses of Instruction requested input from the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) on students receiving units without any method of assessment other than participation. In this letter, he noted that students are also earning units of credit for attending lectures or presentations without evidence that the expected out-of-class work actually took place. There was no request for a response on this issue. The CEP discussed the issues presented from the COCOI and brought them to Chris Cullander, Director of the Office of Institutional Research. Director Cullander indicated that an evaluation in additional to attendance is consistent with defining measurable student learning outcomes as well as improving the learning experience. There was no comment on the issue of expectation of out-of-class work. The CEP’s memo to the COCOI agreed that the course forms require a method of evaluation other than participation. The February 1, 2012 letter from CEP to COCOI concurred with the statement by Chris Cullander and recommended that the course forms require a notation of the method of evaluation for any course where students earn units.

There are several issues surrounding units:

1. Students receiving units for participation only – Completed by COCOI
2. Students receiving units with confirmation that out-of-class work actually occurred. - UCEP
3. The out-of-class work is not equal by course type. - UCEP
4. Online course time-frame for units. - There is a task force on web-based course time. This issue of courses is currently being address by the UCEP.

ACTION: Gather all documents regarding the issues surrounding the issue of units.
ACTION: Assign a liaison from CEP to COCOI.
Abbey Alkon asked how/whether the University of California Academic Regulation 760, which reads “The value of a course in units shall be reckoned at the rate of one unit for three hours’ work per week per term on the part of a student, or the equivalent” fits into the many types of online courses that will be made available by UCSF.

**ACTION:** Submit a request for leadership by the Registrar’s office on the designation of online or other types of courses.

**Interprofessional Education – Scott Reeves, Director, Center for Innovation in Interprofessional Education (IPE)**

Scott Reeves presented a year in review for the Center for Innovation in Interprofessional Education Center (IPE), noting that they had just held a retreat in December with its newly appointed staff. They also met a goal to get a website up. This site is under construction at [https://interprofessional.ucsf.edu/](https://interprofessional.ucsf.edu/).

**Student Grievance Procedures – David Irby**

Renee Navarro, Catherine Lucey, and Joe Castro have appointing three working groups to make recommendations regarding 1) early identification of students that are struggling academically and may need assistance, 2) remediation strategies, and 3) academic dismissal and student grievance procedures.

There is concern that there are no institutional strategies for identifying and helping students who experience academic difficulties. In addition, if a student is dismissed the current policies and procedures are burdensome and time consuming for the student and the university. It takes from 9 months to one year to appeal the decision, during which time the student is not eligible for financial aid or student housing.

The three committees, which are receiving guidance from an attorney provided by the UC Office of General Counsel, will be completing their reports in February and the Committee on Educational Policy will receive their reports in March or April. Recommendations for changing the grievance policy are the responsibility of the Academic Senate, beginning with CEP.

David requested 30 minutes on a future CEP agendas to allow committee review of the proposed changes to university policies, when they become available. He expects it to take 6 months to complete the Academic Senate review and voting process.

The goal of these committees is to provide guidelines that will make the entire process transparent to students and be supportive of schools’ responsibilities to graduate only those who achieve graduation competencies and are capable of succeeding at the next level of training or practice.

General guidelines for the new grievance policies will likely include the following: school screening of each student’s progress toward and approval for graduation (no change); school in-depth review of students experiencing academic difficulties with power to dismiss failing students (no change from current; however, major change because the ad hoc grievance committee which has students and a faculty member from another school is eliminated); and appeal to the dean of the school on procedural grounds only (no change except it eliminates the further appeal to the Academic Senate). The new grievance policies will likely include the following: school screening of each student’s progress toward and approval for graduation (no change); school in-depth review of students experiencing academic difficulties with power to dismiss failing students (no change from current; however, major change because the ad hoc grievance committee which has students and a faculty member from another school is eliminated); and appeal to the dean of the
school on procedural grounds only (no change except it eliminates the further appeal to the Academic Senate).

CEP will review the complete document, submit it to the respective schools, and create policies as needed.

**Coursera Advisory Committee**

Joe Castro invited a member of CEP to be involved in Coursera Advisory meetings Chair Wilson responded that online courses that are not being reviewed by the COCOI and suggested that a smaller group be assembled for online courses to include COCOI and CEP. Abbey Alkon volunteered to attend online meetings and report to the CEP.

At the first meeting of the Coursera Advisory Committee, the issue of whether the Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCOI) should review the Coursera online to assure good quality. Gail noted that these courses are evidence based and present learning objectives prior to being made available through Coursera. If there is a change in status and courses are approved for credit, this will change the course review (COCOI) status.

**On-line Courses**

Documents reviewed: CEP Recommendations Regarding Faculty Development about Online Learning, Course Development, and Courses at UCSF (version 1 with tables by Babson Survey Group and version 2 without tables). Also presented were the Matrix of Online Activity developed by the Office of Student Academic Affairs, and a Course Evaluation Survey from the School of Nursing.

Committee members Abby Alkon and John Maa attended the University of California All-Campus Working Meeting, Innovative Learning Technology Initiative on Saturday, April 13th at the UC Office of the President. Other attendees were from UC Berkeley, UC Davis, UC Merced, and UC Santa Cruz. All other campuses met at UC Irvine.

The meeting was designed to discuss the decision-making process in developing online courses for undergraduate students with faculty, administration and student representatives.

Other issues discussed were:

- Online course definition – should it be the platform (content) or mode of delivery?
- Course designation—COCOI is including this information for online and IPE courses in the upgrade of the course review system.

**Faculty Development Advisory Committee**

Tina Brock noted that the committee will report its findings on June 18th, 2013 to the Faculty Development Advisory Committee and will also present them to the Coordinating Committee on June 19th, 2013. Member of the

**Technology Retreat**

Gail Persily suggested that the committee hold a technology retreat. Chair Wilson suggested finding a speaker. John Maa had suggested bringing California Senator Marc Leno to UCSF to discuss technology. Discussion continued. Joe Castro suggested creating a presentation for the campus to discuss the experience of those who have courses on Coursera. Kari Stewart noted the online educational portal as a space to review possible programs.
University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) – Tamara Alliston

The March UCEP meeting discussed the following issues:

- Funding ($10 million) provided by Governor Jerry Brown for UC online education that will now allow the University to focus on getting systems in place to facilitate online education. (SB547)
- Acknowledged the Academic Senate for its strength in moving online education forward
- University of California Online Education (UCOE) sees itself as a bank of best practices for online courses with four instructional designers as resources.
- Approval of systemwide online courses to improve accessibility and increase enrollment while maintaining excellence in education.
- The Policy on Consolidates Financial Aid Reform for undergraduates is scheduled to be written on March 21, 2013.