

Minutes of Meeting April 12th, 2011

Approved May 26th 2011

Final

Committee Attendees: Austin, Hanna-Harwell, Hardinger, Lew, Loehner, Lynch, Mamer, McDonald, Pires, Snyder. Guests: Rob Rodgers, Curtis Fornadley

1. Quick Topics

- a. Minutes from 3/8/11 meeting approved for posting with changes as indicated in second draft.
- b. UC-OIPP project was awarded \$748K from the Next Generation Learning Challenges Program. OIPP has also indicated that it will be drawing on a loan made available to it by Office of the President on the order of \$2M-\$6M.

2. Update on 3/16/11 meeting with FEC chair Ray Knapp regarding Online Instruction

FCET Chair John Mamer briefed the committee on his meeting with Ray Knapp. The following are notes from the subsequent discussion. Prof. Mamer's notes from the 3/16/11 meeting were sent to the committee listserv on 4/11/11.

The Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) heard a presentation from Brian Copenhaver regarding his experiences with an online version of his Philosophy 3 course offered this past summer. The presentation raised many issues for the FEC. For example, how do you test students? How should you define a credit hour? How will you assure downstream courses that students are prepped properly if they take a course via online means?

The FEC is trying to grapple with the administrative and academic issues of how online courses will integrate with other UCLA courses. The FEC had originally considered appointing a subcommittee to look at the issues but has instead asked the FCET to consider online instruction at UCLA and draft some guidelines for it.

How will online courses evolve? With live classes it is very iterative and instructors can easily adjust the course during the quarter, as a result we give leeway to an in-person course. With an online course if it is all pre-recorded it is much more difficult to change midstream so should there be less leeway?

People who propose online courses are going to need a pattern to shoot at. When preparing for a live course there is a course template. With the current online situation you have the potential for a lot of upfront costs but there is no template to shoot for. You could get to the stage of seeking approval from Graduate or Undergraduate Council having invested a lot in an online course and get turned down.

There is an existing document for undergraduate courses for what is needed. The academic hurdle should be the same. Ultimately this will be part of the implicit knowledge of teaching faculty of online courses.

Student assessment is a feature of a course that has to be anticipated in an online course. At Berkeley for an online biochemistry course the final must be in person and proctored on campus. For other programs proctoring centers at other universities (~\$100/exam) are considered acceptable. These are the issues we need to surface so that the course approval process can be made aware of them.

It was noted that with OIPP the solicitation was looking for *existing* courses. In a way this is an end-run around the course approval process since pedagogy falls within the teaching faculty's prerogative so it is not really scrutinized.

OIPP has clarified that it will ask its PIs to seek local senate approval, but nonetheless this issue exists and UCLA needs to look at all online instruction and how it wishes to approach it.

How are we assessing the profitability of these? Will students pay extra fees, will some lecturers be laid off? The academic appropriateness needs to be considered. Who are you going to teach this to? To registered students? To community college students? To foreign students? Departments should be asked to state this explicitly.

Some view Summer Sessions as 'The Great Loophole' and felt that perhaps that process needs to be reviewed. That said, the committee recognized that it is desirable to have a place to incubate ideas. It needs to be made clear that there are some barriers when you want to scale up and it is at that point that the institution should require more review.

We should create a consistent set of criteria that operate at UCLA. Just because you find a cable TV company that will endow a class on the Arts, doesn't mean different rules should apply. The fitness of that course etc. should still follow the same guidelines.

The guidelines should be consistent and transparent but not necessarily Draconian. These would be adopted by the campus bodies who will have these courses thrust upon them; seeking approval. These guidelines would fill the current 'gap in the literature'.

What would we exempt? Courses primarily in person but which use online technology? For example an online fieldtrip should not need the same vetting.

Towards the end of the discussion it was decided that the FCET would accept the FEC's challenge to issue a statement based on our own experience and the experience of other schools.

John Mamer will begin a document for comment. We will look for any other institutions with online policy statements, exemplars of general guidelines and articulation agreements as well as the UCLA template for traditional course approval.

A related but separate idea regarding the feasibility of establishing a targeted online program was discussed and was very thought provoking. It was felt that the committee could refine this idea and discuss it further with campus entities.

In brief, why not establish a program for online instruction in which students are guaranteed transfer spots should they perform at a certain level, if they do not qualify for a transfer spot, they would still have an AA degree.

It would be a self-supporting program. The University would still have the same admission standards. There would be no financial aid. It was noted that this was similar to something proposed in the business school in the past. Members commented that at some level this is what is already happening with pre-med students. One positive aspect is that students would be highly motivated to perform, which is one of the difficulties with online retention rates.

3. Update on CCLE with Curtis Fornadley

Usage of the CCLE system has seen consistent growth. Measures such as the total number of users on the system, logins per quarter as well as amount of data being moved are all rising. A much needed new user interface was deployed over summer. The Department of Statistics is now on the CCLE shared system and Division of Life Sciences hopes to move completely to CCLE by this Fall.

The Fall Moodle 2.0 migration will be bringing several improvements.

Why Moodle 2.0

- Moodle 2.0 was released in November 2010.
- New Features:
 - Improved navigation: collapsible navigation bars with drop down hierarchy
 - Improved text and html editor
 - Ability for student can push their work to e-portfolios
 - Quiz was improved /more user friendly
 - Wiki has been revamped
 - More control on where items can be place on page
 - Blogs are now linked to courses not user profiles
 - Conditional activities
 - Integration with various content repositories.
 - Content linked to the instructor NOT the course

A content repository pilot will be going on simultaneously to the transition to version 2.0. The primary benefit to using a repository is that rather than loading copies of documents to multiple course websites, links to a document housed in a separate repository are placed on the course website. In this way, one master copy exists and changes to it do not need to be updated on the course site since the site links to the master copy. CCLE is hoping to find a UCLA supported repository solution. There is already usage of Google docs and Dropbox, and some on campus are worried about cloud computing and security.

Calls of interest in UCLA's experience with Moodle have been coming from other UCs and other campuses as LMS market consolidates (Blackboard acquisition of Angel and WebCT).