



Committee on Courses of Instruction

Annual Report 2003-04

Melvin Heyman, MD
Chair

The Committee on Courses of Instruction met six times during 2003-04.

Issues reviewed and acted on by the Committee include:

- Improved communication, coordination, and processes involved in the course catalog review; clarified the roles of the OAR and the Office of the Academic Senate.
- Updated course forms used by the Academic Senate and the OAR to process course catalog requests.
- Identified discrepancies in unit calculation formulas as applied by the four schools and the OAR, resulting in an effort by the Committee to make these formulas consistent across the entire campus.
- Total course requests reviewed in the 2004-03 academic year
 - 109 new courses
 - 88 course change requests
 - 35 course deletions
 - 1 reinstatement of a course
 - 16 course requests cancelled by, or returned to the Department
- Reviewed 21 applications for the UCSF Library Instructional Grants Program (IGP), recommending seven grants totaling \$43,515.

Campus Issues

Clarification of Roles and Responsibilities of the OAR and the Academic Senate

Beginning in the fall of 2002, the Office of the Academic Senate initiated with the Office of Admissions and Registrar (OAR) an examination of the course review process, in order to better define the roles and responsibilities for each unit and to ensure that the work of the Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCOI) was supported in an efficient and thorough manner. Major changes have been implemented by the Academic Senate Office to support the work of the committee, including creation and use of uniform, standard forms accessible by all schools. Additionally, all schools can now obtain information on timelines, access to forms, and access to other tools and information related to completing forms, on the Academic Senate website at: <http://www.ucsf.edu/senate/courseactions/index.html>

In 2003-04, COCOI Vice Chair Kathleen Puntillo and the Senate Office developed a set of protocols identifying the roles and responsibilities of the Senate Office and the Office of Registrar [**Appendix 1**]. The clarification of roles has assisted the Committee in functioning more efficiently.

Summary of Enhancements to the Course Review Process

- The Committee implemented an administrative practice to allow course forms to be processed at the earliest possible review cycle, regardless of when the action is to go into effect.
- The Senate Office provides administrative support to communicate Committee requests for additional information related to processing courses, which facilitates timely course approval.
- Faculty members now receive a formal communication from the Senate Office relative to the completion of the review process and confirmation that a course will be updated in the online catalog by the OAR. Previously, faculty had to check the online catalog (which was not always updated in a timely fashion) to determine whether any action was taken by the COCOI. [**Appendix II**].
- The OAR now submits course forms to the Committee in a more timely and efficient manner, providing a summary of all course forms received by school and requested action
- The Senate and the OAR include information about the course review process on their respective websites, including a detailed timeline for submission, review, and catalog updates. This increases transparency and understanding among faculty and staff about the process and facilitates the work for all involved parties.
- Course Catalog updating is monitored by OAR to correct any omissions or errors and to ensure accuracy.

Development of New Course Forms for the Course Review Process

The Committee, assisted by the Academic Senate Office, developed new course forms and evaluation forms that improve information collection-

- Course Evaluation: The new evaluation form conforms to the new course forms and eliminates unnecessary fields already covered by the Registrar's administrative review.
- Course Form (long): new fields include duration of course, restrictions, calculation of units with explanation, checkbox for graduate academic credit, and comments/justifications for the request. This form is available as both a MS Word and Adobe Acrobat document on the Senate and OAR websites.
- Course Change Form (short): used for changes in quarter, course number, location, title, and/or instructor.
- Course Deletion Form: used for deletion of a course.
- The Committee agreed to develop online instructions for faculty who need to submit course forms. This work has been extended to the 2004-05 academic year.

Development of Course Review Process for On-going/Current Courses

Courses may continue for many years without systematic review. Over the past two years, the Committee discussed processes in place in the various Schools for oversight and review of continuing courses. Each school, through their respective Educational Policy Committees, was asked to submit to the Committee the process involved in ascertaining that ongoing courses are still accurately reflected by the OAR and the course listings. This review has not been completed, and a process to continue to review continuing courses needs to be clarified. Issues that need to be clarified include who monitors that course descriptions are accurate, course directors and instructors are unchanged, course titles remain accurate, unit values are accurate and appropriate, etc.

Review of Unit Calculation Formulas and Course Activity Descriptions

The Committee discussed and identified discrepancies in unit calculation formulas as applied by the Schools and the Office of Admissions and the Registrar. For example, at UCSF, the Schools of Dentistry, Medicine, and Pharmacy use the seminar formula of 1 unit = 3 hours per week or 30 total hours per quarter. However, the School of Nursing and the OAR uses the seminar formula of 1 unit = 1 hour per week or 10 hours total per quarter. [Appendix IV]

The Committee agreed to revise the Unit Formula document, adding brief descriptions of course activities and a comment about Senate Regulation 760 to help clarify the divergent applications of the unit formula. This work is extended to the 2004-05 academic year.

Review and Recommendation of Applicants to the UCSF Library's Instructional Grants Program

The Instructional Grants Program offers grants up to \$10,000 annually to fund innovative instructional improvement projects developed by UCSF faculty, students, and staff. At its meetings of March 25 and 31, 2004, the Committee reviewed and recommended seven applications for funding.

Noting that many of the technological requests were for similar items and/or services, the Committee strongly recommended that Gail Persily, Director of the CIT, be given discretion in administering any funds that meet the needs of the grant proposals while also providing potential benefit to the wider campus community. Specifically, the Committee advised that Persily seek efficiencies of scale by considering recruitment of an in-house, temporary staff member with the necessary skills to support multiple web-based projects. Furthermore, the Committee felt that whenever possible, the CIT might purchase any equipment necessary to support the approved grants that might also be made available to other faculty and staff through the library.

Based on the Committee's deliberations, Gail Persily and Brian Warling, Assistant Director, CIT, have reconsidered how the initial call (broadcast in November of each year) and applicant evaluations are managed. Persily and Warling plan to propose substantive changes to this process at the Committee's first meeting in 2004-05 academic year.

Oversight of Graduate Division Course Requests

At its meeting of February 7, 2003, the Coordinating Committee agreed that 1) Graduate Council approval is not necessary for Graduate Division course reviews, and 2) a faculty representative from the Graduate Division should be appointed as an ex officio COCOI member to provide oversight of these course requests (COCOI and Graduate Council have since revised their bylaws to reflect the role of a member of the Graduate Division on COCOI).

Graduate Division courses offered by the four Schools undergo a process of review by the Department or Division chair, the School's curricular committee (or educational policy committee), and the School's Dean *before* submission to the OAR. The OAR then conducts an administrative review to ensure that all form fields and approval signatures are completed. Following the administrative review, the OAR transmits the course forms to the Office of the Academic Senate, which prepares the forms for the Committee's substantive evaluation and review.

However, since no single campus body oversees Graduate Division courses, these course forms only receive an administrative review by the OAR before coming to the COCOI. Often, the COCOI must return these forms to the originating departments and/or divisions because of inaccuracies or lack of information. As such, at the November 11, 2003 meeting, COCOI members recommended reexamining the Graduate Council's bylaws in order to review the current gap in oversight and to determine whether the Academic Senate Graduate Council should review Graduate Division courses prior to review by COCOI.

Issues to Consider in 2004-05

Continuing issues and/or new topics for next year include:

- Finalization of course activity definitions and unit calculation formulas
- Drafting and posting online instructions for new course forms on the Academic Senate Website
- Survey departments, divisions, and schools for feedback about the new course review process
- Development of process for oversight of continuing/ongoing courses
- Evaluation of existing process for Graduate Division course requests
- Determine if the Graduate Division ex officio member is sufficient to improve oversight and communication regarding Graduate Division courses
- Consideration of Library proposal to institute changes in the Instructional Grants Program call and review process

Respectfully submitted,

Committee on Courses of Instruction

Mel Heyman, Chair
Kathleen Puntillo, Vice Chair
Eileen Grady
C. Anthony Hunt
Mark Ryder
Charlene Harrington
Stephen Kahl
Arthur Miller
Meg Newman

Senate Staff:
Janet Whittick
476-1308
jwhittick@senate.ucsf.edu
www.ucsf.edu/senate

Appendices

- I. Proposal: Roles and Responsibilities of the Office of Admissions and the Registrar (OAR) and the Academic Senate Office (AS) Related to Course Reviews (10/27/2003)
- II. Communication from the Office of the Academic Senate to the OAR with Results of the Summer 2004 Review Cycle (05/21/2004)
- III. Communication for the OAR to the AS with Checklist of Course Forms Submitted by all Departments (07/7/2004)
- IV. Comparison of Unit Formulas from Schools, OAR, and Other Institutions (4/28/04)