Members Present:

Rajan Selvarajan
Arnab Mukherjea
Thomas Padron
Gr Keer
Mary D'Alleva

Meeting started 3:00pm.

Member welcome and introductions.

Review of agenda.

Reviewed summary of last year's efforts.
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1BRJOW9dfbgzec2ElUORMhvaoN3zLb_R5sm5eWf0LxnA/edit?usp=sharing

Discussed the CO's new attributes and related faculty survey being implemented by the CCE this year. Looked at impact and crossover with work of the SLS.
https://padlet.com/marydalleva/7x3jv7vk2j4zdg3v

Point raised - the Rapid Action Advisory Committee has discussed not just certification for online courses, but some type of 'certification' or approval for faculty to teach these courses. Looking at CE courses on the instructor level - would it be beneficial to implement similar process? Ensuing conversation addressed how the CCE finds out about new faculty teaching these courses "after the fact" and that there is no formal process pointing faculty to the CCE as a point of preparation. MD informed the group that the CCE is preparing multiple faculty videos re pedagogy and course implementation that might be useful for this type of effort.

Committee reviewed list of possible topics/activities for the year
(https://docs.google.com/document/d/1yvsg3Inv39Yyaf1D5lLuejpCaWdjnDbRbO_MmzsXN_w/edit?usp=sharing). Reviewed the notes from last year regarding S-designation of courses or campus policy for courses. Need to align with (work in tandem to) new attribute process. MD explained implementation and follow up to faculty survey which identifies attributes. Much of that process is "technical" and would seem to be best managed through the CCE.

Question raised - Where would SLS be most useful? Importance of SLS as representing faculty and providing support for pedagogy and curriculum. How can SL be part of the process? If S-Designation then possibility for review of syllabi - not only as "critique" but as representing interest of supporting student learning. Committee agreed that any policy/designation process

should be practical and realistic, with clear outcome/purpose. Point raised on essential connection to student learning. Discussion of how attributes and S-designation may support transparency with students. Discussed how implementation of curriculum and reporting on these activities is inconsistent.

Discussion addressed the difference between an S-Designation (as an optional effort for depts/faculty) versus policy which would be a requirement. If S-Designation - what would be motivation? Point raised of student learning (and GI 2025) as important motivators. With a look ahead to the need for updating RTP to better reflect faculty efforts.

Since it was not clear whether we are developing S-Des. or policy suggestion made to work on the material and then look at best way to implement. Point raised that we need to create a visual framework to best clarify what we are doing. Discussion addressed three points of entry: new SL courses (Curriculog connection), current SL courses, S-Designation. The importance of framework provides clear info for faculty/depts on what happens with these courses. So that when faculty are assigned these courses there is a clear roadmap that not only *could* be provided by depts but *should* be.

MD explained that CCE has multiple resources for faculty but not all departments/faculty utilize CCE resources.

Brainstorm for content for framework:
"You are teaching one of these courses, here's what's next."
"The university values CE/SL. Here is how the university identifies. Here is how it works on a system level. Here is what you need to do."

MD shared a sample for a process map in Padlet. https://padlet.com/cce8/calstates4
Committee agreed this would be useful as starting point. MD will create the template. MD sending committee the link to the sample and link to an information page with details on CO attribute process.

Question raised - ASI representative on committee? Info from CIC is that CIC is addressing this with ASI regarding multiple committees.

Point raised that Gr Keer has been left off Senate listing of members in one of CIC meeting documents.

Point raised that Committee should discuss electing new Chair.

Discussion of next meetings - pending other Committee members availability - Committee agreed to working meeting on 10/12 and 10/26 from 3-430 to develop content for framework.

Meeting adjourned 4:30.