

**Committee on Courses of Instruction**  
**Igor Mitrovic, MD, Chair**

**ANNUAL REPORT**  
**2016-2017**

**Primary Focus Points for the Year:**

- Web Based Coursework
- Review of New Interprofessional Education Course Instructions
- Committee on Education Policy Collaboration
- Late Course Submissions

**Issues for Next Year (2017-2018)**

- Evaluating Efforts to Address Late Course Submissions
- Collaboration with Education Policy Committee
- Improving Course Submission in School of Nursing

---

**2016-2017 Members**

**Igor Mitrovic, Chair**  
**Jaekyu Shin, Vice Chair**

Melinda Cuthbert  
Annette Carley  
Jeffery Lansman  
Michael McMaster  
Barbara Panning  
Maya Vijayaraghavan  
Lisa Winston

---

**Ex-Officio Members**

Doug Carlson, University Registrar

---

**Number of Meetings:5**

**Senate Analyst:** Artemio Cardenas

---

## Divisional Business

This year, the Committee on Courses of Instruction took up the following issues related to the San Francisco Division:

### **Evaluating Web-based Coursework**

In October, COCOI members received a course form from an instructor that intended only to provide web-based instruction. Reviewing members 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. Committee members then asked Analyst Cardenas to do a review of web-based course policies and provide the committee with guidance on how to proceed. In December, Analyst Cardenas informed members that in 2011, the COCOI and Education Policy Committee's (EPC) reviewed systemwide reports and policies on web-based courses. Based on archived records, COCOI and EPC did not comment on any of the systemwide materials because the policies mainly regarded undergraduate education.

COCOI members reviewed the systemwide task force report on online education and they identified a set of recommended questions for the evaluation of online courses ([Appendix 1](#)). Members requested that all recommended questions be added to the course form for web-based courses. Members believe that asking the the online-specific questions will help to challenge course preparers to meet higher-quality standards when developing their course.

### **Review of New Interprofessional Education Course Instructions**

In October, the members of the Program on Interprofessional Education (PIPE) asked COCOI to review and approve updated language describing IPE course designation ([Appendix 2](#)). The changes had been made to reduce confusion amongst course directors, instructors, and students. Committee members reviewed and discussed the proposal. Members expressed concern that when reviewing an interprofessional course, there is no way of knowing whether the course meets all of the necessary criteria listed in the draft text. Members agreed that, while the Interprofessional reviewers are responsible for ensuring that the course proposal meets of the necessary requirements, there should be more transparency for COCOI. No action was taken in October. In April, committee members again reviewed updated revisions to the interprofessional course submission instructions. After discussion, members approved of the changes and asked that a section be added to the course review system for interprofessional courses.

## Committee Business

This year, the Committee on Courses of Instruction took up the following issues:

### **Committee on Education Policy Discussion**

In October, the Senate's Committee on Committees proposed merging the Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCOI) with the Educational Policy Committee (EPC). The reasoning is that on most other UC campuses, the responsibility for course review and approvals is granted to just EPC. After discussion by members of COCOI and EPC, all members voted against a merge and requested that both committees find a way to increase collaboration amongst the two committees. To follow up on the issue, members of EPC were invited to the April COCOI meeting to discuss ways the two committees could collaborate together. Common issues that members identified included, resolving late course form submissions, supporting interprofessional education efforts and increasing faculty training. Most of the discussion focused on the topic of late course submissions. The committees agreed they would work together. Finally, all agreed that there should be a joint meeting between COCOI and EPC at least once or twice a year. The meetings will be a great opportunity to follow up on action items and to collaborate on common issues.

### **Report on Late Course Submissions**

In October, Associate Registrar Jeff Harter informed the committee that course submissions past deadlines has become a chronic problem. In December, he reported on trends in submissions ([Appendix 3](#)) The most recent quarters 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. 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. Communications about meeting the deadlines were created. The first was a one-time message from the Committee on Courses of Instruction Chair informing academic leadership about the issue. Another, meant to be sent automatically every term four weeks before the major deadline, targeted form preparers who had used the Course Review System in the past year, as well as Instructors of Record of courses in the salient term.” Academic Senate Analyst Artemio Cardenas and Academic Senate Programmer George Michaels worked to create an automated reminder to go out to instructors three to four weeks before the deadline.

### **Report on Inactive Courses**

In April, Associate Registrar Jeff Harter compiled a list of courses that should be designated inactive ([Appendix 4](#)). Inactive Courses are defined as courses that have enrollment in five years. There were thirty seven courses that were deemed inactive. Of those, thirty five were placed in inactive status and two that remained active.

## **Appendices**

- Appendix 1: [Recommended Questions For Evaluation of Online Courses](#)
- Appendix 2: [Interprofessional Education Recommended Questions](#)
- Appendix 3: [Trends in Late Course Submissions](#)
- Appendix 4: [List of Inactive Courses](#)

Senate Staff:  
Artemio Cardenas, Senate Analyst  
Artemio.Cardenas@ucsf.edu; 415/476-4245