Academic Policy Meeting of 29March 2016

Members Present: Kimberly Ange-vanHeugten, Sarah Ash, David Auerbach, Alton Banks, Paul Hoffman, Sheila Smith McKoy

Members Absent: Thomas Byrnes, Mike Devetsikiotis, Helmut Hergeth, Doug Pearce, Rich Spontak

Guests: Chris Ashwell, David Austin, Deanna Dannels, Barbara Kirby, Li Marcus, Jason Miller

Meeting was called to order at 3pm, and guests were asked to introduce themselves.

Main issue of meeting was to address CIM and issues related to faculty time spent in adding data to CIM (Courseleaf Inventory Management) for courses.

Li Marcus illustrated some of the modifications to CIM, addressing major points of concern for both CUE and UCCC. Modifications to CIM that facilitated data entry include:

- The ability to import data for courses that were presently inactive and needed to be activated in the CIM system.
- The facility of entry for minor revisions (minor edits), with the goal of reducing time/effort needed to update data in CIM. Marcus pointed out the several meetings she had held with colleges across campus with the goal of improving the efficiency of data entry in CIM.
- One additional feature was the ability to import data from an older course that could serve as a starting point for a new course (based upon the older course). This feature will automatically populate areas such as the CIP discipline specialty number (CIP) code for courses that the instructor would not know.
- Other modifications were made to simplify the work flow.

Marcus expressed the willingness to talk further with faculty/colleges who have concerns about CIM. The changes demonstrated were universally applauded by those in attendance.

The issue of the syllabus tool(ST) arose. It was pointed out that the ST had been constructed by a group in DELTA, which continues to monitor and affect changes in that application. DELTA originally created the ST to provide consistent syllabi for DE courses. One thought expressed was the desire to have data entered in the ST flow into CIM (and vice versa). While discussions regarding this ability have been held, no current action is underway.

The concern of DELTA is that the flow of information between ST and CIM will require extensive programming effort, and wants to learn if such a facility is desirable by a large fraction of faculty. Currently about 20% of faculty regularly use the ST. There was an estimate of $100,000 for the cost to integrate ST and CIM.

Chris Ashwell was asked to provide an update on the status of the review of GEP courses. He distributed a table (included below). The SUMMARY is that of 1036 GEP courses (new and existing) 415 remain to be reviewed. Roughly 60% of the courses have been vetted since 2009, with 40% remaining to be vetted. The summary also indicates the distribution of GEP courses by college.

	# of courses in GEP (new and existing) since 2009 (currently active)	# of courses to be reviewed/validated	CALS	COD	CED	COE	CHASS	CNR	PCOM	COS	COT	DASA
HUM	267	203		2			195					6
GK	227	13	1				5	2				5
SS	82	69	4				58	3	3			1
IP	112	25	4				3	9	1	1	2	5
HES	79	0										
MS	22	0										
NS	102	65	28					5		27	2	2
VPA	70	34		11	1		12				1	9
USD	75	6					6					
Totals:	**1036**	**415**	**37**	**13**	**1**	**0**	**279**	**19**	**4**	**28**	**5**	**28**

The discussion with the Associate Deans(ADs) in 2009 was to develop a schedule for approving GEP courses. Rather than agreeing upon a schedule, the ADs suggested that they would work toward completing the task. There are two tasks at play (1) approving the GEP courses and (2) entering courses for the GEP, and ultimately all courses, into CIM.
The implementation of CIM (roughly 2 years now) mandates the entry of course information into CIM as a prelude to approval via CUE and UCCC. While the approval of GEP courses is important, AP tried to focus on the issue of the entry of course data into CIM, as that issue of concern had been raised by CHASS, in general, and David Austin, in particular.

AD Dannels (CHASS) pointed out that CHASS had a plan for entering the courses from CHASS into CIM and getting those approved (critical since CHASS has the largest percentage of GEP courses). Dannels noted that much of her time had been spent with faculty agreeing that the intellectual process of specifying and clarifying GEP course data was important. As a result of those conversations, Dannels developed a plan for entering data on the GEP courses. Dannels noted that she had identified some financial resources and persons to enter the information into CIM, but that her resources were insufficient to complete the entry of ALL the CHASS courses into the CIM system.

Barbara Kirby commended AD Dannels for her efforts on establishing a plan for entering courses into CIM and having CHASS data entered into CIM. Various mechanisms for having course data into CIM were discussed. Barbara Kirby noted that the entry was a college level decision, and that no deadlines for entry were specified. The general consensus was that about 400 courses would need to have course data entered into CIM.

Difficulties of having part-time workers enter data into CIM were noted, but suggestions were made (Jason Miller) that once faculty members entered all the data into a syllabus, part-time workers could enter the data into CIM with consultations with faculty members held as appropriate. There were two major thoughts: (1) conversations about courses were always helpful and (2) the entry of data could be problematic. The opinion was expressed that since CHASS has the lion's share of the burden of entering all course data--and especially data on GEP courses--into CIM, perhaps the University should provide resources to the college for that data entry. A competing argument was that colleges obtain credit for the SCH generated, and hence should assume the burden of entering the data for courses for which they receive funds by offering those SCH.

The question was posed as to how many courses any one faculty member controls, and hence bears responsibility for that intellectual property. That answer was not forthcoming. The counter argument was that faculty members should spend time on more valuable tasks than the clerical nature of entering data into CIM. That argument also suggested that the erosion of faculty time was an ongoing process.

A discussion was held about learning outcomes and their use in courses, and that some faculty exhibit a lack of understanding of learning objectives. AD Dannels suggested that learning objectives had taken a back seat to the mechanical process of entering data into CIM. Kirby pointed out that the use of CIM was a parallel to the older editable PDF files, with CIM offering a work flow option which was not available in the previous system. The prediction was that the flow of courses into CUE and UCCC would speed up as users become more familiar.

The question was posed if older archived data could be imported into CIM as a starting point for entering data for current courses. Answer: PDF data is available, but would need updating as current course information supersedes the older course data. Are there other end goals? Course catalog tied to 8-semester display? Answer: Catalog is tied to 8-semester display. Degree audits were noted to be a SIS system. Kirby noted the promise of open labs available during summer so that faculty could enter data into CIM—with supporting staff present to assist the faculty. It was noted that UNC-CH has just moved to the CIM system.

Marcus pointed out that, for courses that have already been approved through CUE/UCCC, she can facilitate the entry of the data into CIM, without the invocation of a course flow. This should also accelerate the entry into CIM, facilitating the availability of data for future revisions of a course.

Questions arose as to promises made as to who/when data would be entered into CIM.

Questions also arose as to the challenge of having 10-year course reviews driven by the college level as opposed to the university level. It was noted that when the 10-year review process was moved to the college level (1995), it effectively quit happening.

Meeting was adjourned.