SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

MINUTES

June 6, 2013 ~ 2:30 pm – 4:30 pm
Strand Hall Room 3171


Regrets:  D. Kugler, S. Richmond

1. Approval of the Agenda
The agenda was approved as presented.

J. Hinchliffe indicated that she would like to discuss the contents of the SCUS forms at a future meeting in particular whether or not Learning Outcomes needs to continue to be requested.  G. Myers will check with J. Driver.

2. Approval of the Minutes of May 2, 2013
The minutes were approved as presented.

Motion 1
It was moved by A. Clapp and seconded by A. Gemino

“that SCUS approve the minutes of May 2, 2013 as presented.”

CARRIED

3. Old Business

a. Faculty of Science [SCUS 13-25]

1. Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry [SCUS 13-25a]

Motion 2
It was moved by G. Agnes and seconded by A. Gemino

“that SCUS approve and recommend to SCUP the Full Program Proposal for the Joint Major in Chemistry and Molecular Biology and Biochemistry.”

CARRIED

Motion 3
It was moved by G. Agnes and seconded by M. Lechner
“that SCUS approve and recommend to SCUP the Full Program Proposal for the Joint Honours in Chemistry and Molecular Biology and Biochemistry.

CARRIED

The Chair will speak to J. Driver as to whether or not a strategy should be developed with regard to the labour market component of the full program proposal.

4. New Business

a. Faculty of Science [SCUS 13-28]

1. Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry [SCUS 13-28a]

Motion 4
It was moved by G. Agnes and seconded by A. Gemino

“that SCUS approve and recommend to SCUP the Notice of Intent: Certificate in Genomics.”

CARRIED

A comment was made regarding the new process for approving certificates which wasn’t followed in this instance. G. Agnes agreed but explained that this proposal meets the criteria for “Certificates designed to provide opportunities for specialization”.

Motion 5
It was moved by G. Agnes and seconded by A. Clapp

“that SCUS approve under delegated authority and send to Senate for information the New Course Proposal: MBB 324-3, Protein Biochemistry effective Spring 2014.”

CARRIED

J. Hinchliffe indicated that the forms will be updated to define more clearly what the repeat for credit field means – it is primarily for selected readings, directed studies, special topics courses where the content changes from term to term and students should be able to repeat for credit. Separate from the policy with regard to repeating failed courses.

2. Department of Biomedical Physiology and Kinesiology [SCUS 13-28b]

Motion 6
It was moved by G. Agnes and seconded by P. budra

“that SCUS approve under delegated authority and send to Senate for information the New Course Proposal: BPK 482-3, Ergonomics and Rehabilitation effective Spring 2014.”

CARRIED
All agreed to delete the Co-requisite. The committee was reminded that if a Criminal Check is considered a prerequisite, not part of the course description.

**Motion 7**
It was moved by G. Agnes and seconded by P. Budra

“That SCUS approve under delegated authority and send to Senate for information the deletion of BPK 380, 488 effective Spring 2014.”

CARRIED

**Motion 8**
It was moved by G. Agnes and seconded by A. Clapp

“That SCUS approve under delegated authority and send to Senate for information the Description and/or Prerequisite change to BPK 448, 484 effective Spring 2014.”

CARRIED

{rationale was updated}

**Motion 9**
It was moved by G. Agnes and seconded by A. Gemino

“That SCUS approve and recommend to SCUP the Full Program Proposal: Occupational Ergonomics Certificate.”

CARRIED

**b. Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences [SCUS 13-29]**

1. Department of Humanities

**Motion 10**
It was moved by P. Budra and seconded by A. Gemino

“That SCUS approve under delegated authority and send to Senate for information the description change to HUM 330, 340 effective Spring 2014.”

CARRIED

{clarification made to where the course description change should be placed; end of existing description}

**c. Faculty of Health Sciences [SCUS 13-30]**

**Motion 11**
It was moved by M. Lechner and seconded by A. Gemino

“That SCUS approve under delegated authority and send to Senate for information the title and description change to HSCI 402 effective Spring 2014.”
d. Report of Online Education Working Group [SCUS 13-31]

Overall comments:
- This document is too operational before a committee has been struck to develop a larger vision.
- What is motivation behind the recommendations?
- Recommendation that the task force do a public presentation/forum.

#1 – University-wide Committee assembled to assess current online learning
Is this a continuing committee? Is there rollover? Is there an end date? How are copyrights dealt with? There is a concern regarding the obstruction for professors to offer their own courses online.

#2 – Funding Model to support online course development and online learning in general at SFU
All agreed establishing a standard rate built into a budget is a good idea but who receives income flowing through the course? Does this include variable expenses? Is the institution supposed to be making a profit? It doesn’t seem established as of yet; not well defined. Incorrect assumption as Business already pays for course development.

#3 – New Funding Model to support development and delivery of CODE courses and online and blended learning opportunities throughout the University
Second sentence doesn’t follow the first very well. Large enrollment courses usually are easier to access. It’s more the 20 seat courses that fill up quicker. When funding halts, who pays? CODE? May be difficulty in persuading faculty to develop courses, not enough incentive and not clear on copyright of material. Profit centre vs. cost centre.

#4 – Entice international students and deliver full programs globally
SFU is already providing courses to international students. Question was raised about integrity. We currently have a significant problem with ID and fraud during exams. How can we confirm the actual student is completing the courses? Integrity must be maintained throughout the duration of the course.
More discussion is needed regarding resources to compete with other institutions offering courses on-line.
Is it cost effective if you are simply replacing sections? It could result in the cannibalization of current offerings. It appears that the institution could take the funds and use them for general revenue. Committee needs to think deeply about the competitive market, MOOCS for example.
All agreed that a market analysis should be implemented as this proposal still needs a lot of thought and discussion. It’s too early to make recommendations on the primary work of the committee regarding revenue and quality.
Curriculum needs to be better than what we do now?

#5 – Departments integrate CODE courses or other online teaching into Core course offerings
Many instructors and departments do not believe there is evidence supporting the fact that online learning is as effective as f2f teaching. All felt the wording in this recommendation is very strong and generalized underestimating the seriousness of centralizing course offerings.
#6 – Students in on-line courses contact CODE when having problems contacting TM or FS
This is a problem and there needs to be one unit identified that takes responsibility for operational issues with students and responding in a timely manner.

#7 – Resources should be provided to interested faculty and instructors to transfer from f2f to online teaching
Further discussion is needed. Presupposes the University wants to do more on-line courses. Base vs overload. Does the University have FLIP [or blended] classrooms? There is a difference between distance education and on-line education.

#8 – Resources dedicated to identifying ways to enhance the teacher-to-student, student-to-student interactions online and in blended delivery modes
Closely related to #7; we already have experience with the phasing in of LMS system, Canvas. Can this be piggy-backed onto that project? (note: CMPT does not use Canvas)

#9 – Basic set of requirements provided to faculty course authors so that online courses have similar core delivery models and concepts
All agreed it is important to ensure student experience be seamless when using online learning, it is frustrating when instructors use different methodology with their online courses. What is the pro and con for the course development done by CODE? Different units have different needs. The report appears to be increasing barriers rather than increasing access.

#10 – All areas use the University’s new LMS system, Canvas
Technology changes so fast the University needs to maintain flexibility, adaptability non-standard approaches. It is too early to make generalizations about Canvas.

Summarize SCUS’ feedback with “good luck”

General discussion indicated a mixed response to MOOCs. Some see them as a significant threat to how we offer courses, may be taken over by the private sector. Others do not see MOOCs as successful but how we respond to change is key.

5. Other Business

1. Calendar Committee member representing SCUS to replace Kugler.

   A. Clapp offered to sit on the Calendar Committee

Minutes prepared by R. Balletta
Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm