

**Institute Undergraduate Curriculum Committee  
Appeals and Academic Matters (Full Committee)  
Tuesday, November 6, 2012**

**Present:** Agrawal (ChBE), Pikowsky (REG), Senf (LCC), Walker (PSYC), Berry (PUBP), Goodisman (BIOL), Mayor (ME), Sankar (AE), Yaszek (LCC), Hollengreen (ARCH), Forman (CoB), Isbell (CoC), Loss (Math), Ludovice (ChBE), Sankar (AE)

**Visitors:** Laros (REG), Merkousko (REG), Potts (VPUE), Snow (APPH), Riley (ECE), Barke (PUBP), Bottomley (CHEM), DeMillo (CoC), Stewart (CRC)

**Note:** All action items in these minutes require approval by the Academic Senate. In some instances, items may require further approval by the Board of Regents or the University System of Georgia. If the Regents' approval is required, the change is not official until notification is received from the Board to that effect. Academic units should take no action on these items until USG and/or BOR approval is secured. In addition, units should take no action on any of the items below until these minutes have been approved by the Academic Senate or the Executive Board.

**Academic Matters**

1. A motion was made to approve a request from the School of Applied Physiology for a new course. The motion was seconded and approved.

**NEW COURSE: (Approved)**

APPH 1050 - The Science of Physical Activity and Health

2-0-2

This course is an additional option for satisfying the current institute wellness requirement. The current requirement, HPS 1040, is a large, lecture based health course that affords little opportunity for students to implement fitness concepts covered in the course. The new course will offer 1 day/week of lecture and 1 day/week of fitness activity with personal responsibility for training additionally outside of class. Students will have the opportunity to choose different lab sections based upon their training preference (Running, Weight Training, Fitness for Beginners, Yoga, etc.). The lab portion of the course will be graded as satisfactory/unsatisfactory based upon attendance and participation. A satisfactory grade will be required in order to earn an overall passing grade for the course. The fitness portion of the class will be conducted by certified instructors employed at the Campus Recreation Center. A course fee (\$35) and waiver for participation will be required. The lecture portion will be conducted by an instructor in Applied Physiology. This instructor will also oversee the fitness activity sections of the course.

**NOTE:** The Committee recommended that the transcript title be changed to something such as “Sci of Phys Act & Health” to make it clearer that the course is about the science of physical activity and health.

**NOTE:** this course will be added as an option within the Wellness requirement in the next edition of the Catalog. Academic units will not be required to submit degree modifications since this course is also a two-hour class and will be an alternative to HPS 1040. Student may take either course to meet the Wellness requirement and both courses are two credits so there is no impact on the hours required for a degree.

2. The Chair of the Committee invited Dr. Rich DeMillo, Dr. Larry Bottomley, and Dr. Richard Barke as guest participants in a discussion of Tech’s participation in Coursera.

The Chair asked that the panelists address three major questions:

- At this point, Coursera courses are non-credit, free of charge, and no support structure is required, except that which the faculty member needs. Is this expected to continue, and, if so, for how long
- If the decision is made to award academic credit for these courses, how will that decision be made and who would be in charge of addressing the necessary administrative and infrastructure questions?
- If the decision is made to award academic credit for these courses, how will student performance be assessed?

Regarding offering Coursera courses for Georgia Tech credit, there appears to be no current plan nor any perceived need to do so. It is possible, however, that short Coursera courses could be incorporated into traditional courses already offered at Tech. It was also noted that Tech already offers online education through its distance learning program, although this education is not “open” nor is it “massive”. Should there be a move to offer Coursera courses for academic credit, there would clearly be a number of issues to be addressed including pricing, administrative infrastructure to admit and grade the students, and how the assessment of learning would be conducted. So far, Coursera offerings have been financed by donor money. There seems to be a particular focus now on how Coursera courses serving General Education curriculum needs could serve well at institutions such as community colleges.

A broad issue, one not necessarily connected with Coursera, is the fact that there is currently no policy or procedure in place to evaluate courses delivered in the on-line format. There is currently no evaluation or review of how existing courses may be altered or changed to accommodate on-line learning. It is the general sense of the Committee that a procedure needs to be in place to request approval to offer courses in the on-line format.

Related to the award of credit, there are discussions underway related to the possible role of the College Board or other similar entities who might act as brokers validating the learning through examinations and the award of credit based on the test scores, very similar to the way in which most institutions currently operate with awarding credit for AP, IB, and other tests. If this solution were pursued, the infrastructure needs on the individual campus would be looked at in a different light.

There is also the larger pedagogical issue of which courses best lend themselves to this kind of course format. It may be the case that some content is appropriate for on-line delivery and some is not. It might be important for the IUCC to engage in a broader discussion about course content and the appropriate ways for teaching to be delivered. There was discussion about how learning outcomes are determined and whether there is a good understanding about what assessment is and how it is best conducted. The Committee will invite Dr. Donna Llewellyn, who could not attend the meeting today, to a future meeting to discuss assessment of learning for on-line courses.

It was noted that the Coursera courses that are currently offered at Tech are not actually full courses. They are, rather, topics that are explored in this format for short lengths of time (e.g., four weeks). Regardless of whether Coursera grows and becomes an integral part of Tech's delivery of education, we will have learned significantly from our experience with the current offerings.

Although not the responsibility of the IUCC, concerns such as faculty workloads, how Coursera opportunities are apportioned or assigned (who is the gatekeeper?), and the impact on RPT assessment were voiced. The possibility was even raised that faculty in the future might develop content that would be delivered by someone else. Will it continue to be the role of faculty to both develop and deliver content?

Committee members circled back several times to the claimed inevitability of Coursera type delivery of education and the changing landscape of higher education in the United States and in the World. Committee members also talked about the different audiences that are being served including the world population that is being provided educational opportunities by Coursera and others in the same vein, and the Georgia Tech student who is a resident student on the campus. There was concern that these two issues, delivering learning opportunities to the world population and to resident students at Tech are being conflated, which is adding to the overall confusion about intent and future plans.

It was suggested that information should be gathered from students, parents, and others about the perception of on-line learning, what it offers, and what need there is for it. Committee members discussed the problem of gathering "informed" opinions on the matter and of determining who is qualified to address the many issues related to on-line learning.

## Administrative Item

1. A motion was made to approve a memorandum addressed to the Provost's Office recommending a policy related to the content of the diploma. The motion was seconded and approved.

As a follow up to the March 16, 2012 memorandum that summarized the discussion of the Curriculum Committees on proposed changes to the GT diploma, the Committee Chairs offer the following official proposal to the Provost. If accepted by the Provost's Office, the following will be noted as the official policy going forward related to the content of the diploma.

### Policy Statement

The information that is included on the GT diploma as of this date will remain. There will be no changes made to the diploma going forward. Although there is some concern about too much information being part of the Undergraduate diploma as it now stands, the policy is to not remove any content that was approved in the past. The policy is to maintain the status quo.

### Pending Requests

The pending requests, including that from the International Plan to add language proficiency information, are denied. However, the language proficiency related to the International Plan will be added to the transcript.

### Procedure

Any future discussion related to the content or appearance of the GT diploma must be vetted through both Curriculum Committees and the Provost's Office.

## Student Petitions

1. A motion was made to approve a written appeal of a request for a waiver of the 36-hour rule. The motion was seconded and approved.

Adjourned,

Reta Pikowsky  
Registrar