Proposed Hybrid Course Policy

Guiding Principles

1) Exploring novel teaching methods is an important tradition in higher education. Online communications provide enhanced opportunities for communication among instructors and students, and instructors have been using them for over a quarter century. However, using them to replace traditional classroom instruction is relatively new. Vigilance is necessary to ensure learning outcomes continue to be met.

2) Academic freedom is an important right that is affirmed by both campus policies and the Board of Regents. However, faculty have both the right and responsibility to oversee instruction. Such oversight is consistent with established definitions of academic freedom as expressed by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges and Universities.

3) In response to abuses at other institutions, the Federal Government has mandated that institutions clearly label courses that involve a significant amount of online content in place of traditional classroom instruction.

This policy document defines hybrid courses containing a mixture of traditional and non-traditional instruction methods and establishes practices for approving and monitoring application of these methods.

Definitions

1) Traditional, synchronous course: any course with regularly scheduled face-to-face class meetings. Course content may be delivered in a variety of ways including classroom lectures, laboratories, and discussion sessions. For the purposes of this document, traditional meetings include those in which video equipment is used to facilitate communication at a distance. In all cases, a key element is that the communication is synchronous; the instructor(s) and students in a section can meet as a group and converse in real time.

2) Distance course: a course that includes no face-to-face class meetings; all content is delivered using online or other out-of-class mechanisms.

3) Online course: distance course in which content is delivered electronically.

4) Hybrid course: a course for which at least 10% and up to 99% of the standard scheduled face-to-face class meeting time has been replaced by asynchronous communications.
between the instructor and the students. A hybrid section is a section of a course that meets this criterion.

- Note: the typical reduction in face-to-face class meeting time is 25 to 75%. The definition presented here is for policy purposes and is not intended to match definitions used by federal regulatory or other agencies.

Providing videotaped lectures and using classroom time for other material does not automatically qualify a course as hybrid, though in some circumstances such methods may mean the classroom time should be considered to be a lab or discussion section rather than a lecture.

**Hybrid Course and Section Policies**

1) Approval

a) Each hybrid section or course offering must have written documentation (not necessarily a syllabus) outlining the use of asynchronous delivery methods. At a minimum, the documentation must address the following:

i) The percentage of face-to-face meeting time that is being replaced by asynchronous delivery methods.

ii) The pattern of face-to-face meetings (such as a given number of times each week).

iii) What asynchronous resources will be used and how they will be used.

iv) The qualifications of the instructor to employ the specified asynchronous methods and how the instructor will be trained if necessary.

Not all sections in a course need to follow the same asynchronous delivery method. In particular, courses may include both hybrid and traditional sections.

b) If the offering department or administrative unit has a curriculum committee, the offering must be approved by that committee. Otherwise, the offering must be approved by the department (unit) as a whole. All such offerings must be forwarded to the college curriculum committee for informational purposes.

c) UUCC is requested to develop forms and reporting standards for the approval of hybrid offerings. However, approval of offerings can proceed without such forms until they become available.

d) UUCC is requested to set standards for how often and under what circumstances hybrid offerings will need to be re-reviewed and when instructor retraining is necessary.
e) Hybrid offerings following a model developed by the Teaching and Learning Center need only be approved at the departmental level. Offerings that significantly deviate from one of these models must also be approved by the college curriculum committee.

f) As of spring, 2013, all hybrid offerings must be approved as described in this policy. It is understood that these offerings will already be listed in schedules, but it is expected that approval for existing offerings can be expedited.

2) Administration

a) A course or section that is offered as a hybrid (by the above definition) must have a notation in the course schedule indicating that the particular course or section is hybrid.

b) The Teaching and Learning Center is requested to develop a set of models for hybrid courses as suggestions for instructors. Since innovation is important in this area, there is no requirement that each course use one of these models, but they should facilitate hybrid course construction.

c) With rare exceptions, on-campus students may not enroll in hybrid sections until they have earned at least 15 credits. Exceptions must be granted by the dean or designee of the college in which the student is a major.

d) Resources for training instructors on hybrid course techniques are to be provided by the university.

3) Assessment

a) Departments that offer hybrid courses must revise their DRB procedures to address how instructors will be evaluated for hybrid course offerings.

b) All hybrid courses or sections must include student evaluations of technology and delivery method each time the course is offered. In addition to the instructor, the evaluation results must be provided to the department chair or designee. At the discretion of the department, these evaluations may be incorporated into teaching evaluations as a part of the Review, Salary, and Tenure (RST) process.
MINUTES
University of Wisconsin-Platteville Faculty Senate
4 p.m. September 25, 2012
University Room North, Pioneer Student Center

Present:
Laura Anderson (LAE, 2015) Chair; Eric Farrell for Jennifer Artz (Academic Staff Liaison); Keith Thompson for Charles Cornett (EMS, 2015 at-large); Shane Drefcinski (LAE, 2013); Melissa Gormley (LAE, 2014 at-large) Vice-Chair; Rob Hasker (EMS, 2014 at-large) Secretary; Osama Jadaan (EMS, 2015 at-large); Margaret Karsten (BILSA, 2015); Rea Kirk (LAE, 2013 at-large); David Kraemer (EMS, 2013); Colleen McCabe (LAE, 2014); Mittie Nimocks Den Herder (Provost, ex officio); Regina Pauly (Karnmann Library, 2014); B.J. Reed (Parliamentarian); Emily Sawle (Student Senate Liaison); Machelle Schroeder (BILSA, 2013); Doyle St. John (EMS, 2014); James Swenson (EMS, 2013 at-large); Amanda Trewin (BILSA, 2014); Irfan Ul-Haq (EMS, 2015)

Absent:
Jennifer Artz (Academic Staff Liaison); Charles Cornett (EMS, 2015 at-large); Dennis Shields (Chancellor, ex officio)

List of guests:
Arthur Ranney; Gaile Schwickerath; Sam Kamps; and Alex Hegeman

I. Call to order
Meeting called to order at 4:03 p.m.

II. Roll call
New Student Senate liaison: Emily Sawle.

III. Approval of the minutes of September 11, 2012
A request was made to add the attendance list to the minutes. The minutes were accepted as distributed with this change.

IV. Approval of the agenda
The agenda was accepted as presented.

V. Announcements and reports
Announcement: The Provost met with the current and previous chairs of the Faculty Senate and URSTPC to discuss compensation plans; a follow-up meeting will be scheduled with the academic deans. Any recommendations will come to Faculty Senate.

1. Update from the URSTPC Committee of the Whole (L. Anderson)
The committee is hoping to have the final draft of the proposed faculty handbook completed midway through the fall semester. They will bring it to Faculty Senate to review and present to the general faculty.

VI. Appointments
2. Faculty Senate appointment to the APC (J. Swenson)
Laura Anderson volunteered since she is already attending. Swenson moved to nominate Anderson as the Faculty Senate representative, Gormley seconded, and the motion carried.

3. Faculty Senate appointment to the AOC (J. Swenson)
Shane Drefcinski volunteered since he is already the chair. Swenson moved to nominate Drefcinski as the Faculty Senate representative, Gormley seconded, and the motion carried.

4. **Faculty Senate appointment to the Women's Council (J. Swenson)**
   Regina Pauley volunteered to serve. Swenson moved to nominate Pauley as the Faculty Senate representative, Gormley seconded, and the motion carried.

5. **Faculty committee amendments (J. Swenson)**
   - Steve Vance has volunteered for the Hazardous Wastes and Materials Committee.
   - Mike Ira had to withdraw from the University Commencement Committee.
   - Mike Forbes is unable to serve on the Improvement of Learning Committee; Yuanyuan Hu has agreed to serve in his place.

Swenson moved, and Drefcinski seconded the above changes. Motion carried.

6. **Appointment to ad hoc committee on course scheduling policies (M. Nimocks Den Herder)**
   Den Herder discussed the Huron report, indicating that we are not very consistent in scheduling classes; part of the report was the suggestion to create a campus wide policy for class scheduling. Den Herder requested a faculty representative be appointed to a committee to develop such a policy. Harker asked whether the policy should be developed by the Registration Committee, and Den Herder explained it was not clear to administration that this committee would be appropriate from the committee's description. Harker moved and Karsten seconded that the classroom scheduling policy be remanded to the Registration Committee. Motion passed.

**VII. Unfinished business**
none

**VIII. New business**

7. **Proposal for social media policy (S. Miller)**
   Miller presented the proposal for a new social media policy for feedback and/or endorsement so that it can be presented to the Chancellor. The social media policy was created to protect the brand and image of the university. This is also to protect faculty and staff of the university when using a professional media account. Miller reiterated that the policy only applies to cases in which the account is created on behalf of a university organization. Private accounts, including those created for personal research, are not covered by this policy. Harker moved to endorse, and Thompson seconded.

   Discussion: the document is long; the actual policy section of the document should be placed more prominently so that it is easier to separate from the advice. Miller has attempted to contact all existing account owners to make them aware of the proposed policy. Motion carried by voice vote.

8. **Proposal for hybrid course policy (R. Harker)**
   Harker presented the hybrid course policy developed by the special committee over the spring and summer of 2012. Gormley moved to endorse the policy, Pauley seconded.

   Discussion: A concern was expressed that all faculty did not have a chance to review the policy. The response was that it was circulated to all faculty and that earlier drafts were circulated to a number of groups. Another concern was that the definition of a hybrid course includes amounts of replaced face-to-face time that are not reasonable given current research and practice. The response was that the policy recognizes that much smaller ranges would be
effective, but the goal was to define a single policy covering all hybrid course activity but then establish a mechanism to ensure only effective models are used. Jadaan recommended that the percentage of asynchronous activity in a hybrid course be reported in the class scheduling system. The motion passed on a voice vote.

9. Resolution on tuition waivers (S. Drefcinski)
Drefcinski explained that on April 12, UW-Stevens Point endorsed a resolution to provide tuition waivers to faculty and staff of the UW System so that family members could attend UW System schools. Karsten moved to endorse this resolution, Schroeder seconded. Concerns were expressed about creating an inequity in benefits among faculty with no eligible children, who would bear the costs (the institutions or the state), and how such a policy would apply to online courses. Swenson pointed out that the public probably assumes we have this benefit, so we might as well take advantage of it. Kramer suggested the primary impact of this policy would be in recruiting new faculty and voiced support for it on that basis. Gormley pointed out that if we do not make demands of the system, then the system won't do anything; this resolution does not create a specific policy, but asks that one be developed. The motion passed on a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Rob Hasker                 Eli Caywood
Secretary                  Recording Secretary
The Faculty Senate approved a motion on Feb. 28, 2012 that reads: "We, the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin-Platteville, request that all academic units declare a moratorium on all new undergraduate hybrid courses -- such courses are defined as any course that reduces face-to-face meeting time by 10 percent or more as a result of an online component -- until a university policy for creation, approval, support, and oversight of such courses has been established and approved by the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Senate."

1) On Sept. 25, 2012, a policy was approved, but it isn't in the minutes. I don't have access to the document. What was that motion?

2) On Sept. 10, 2013, the form was rejected, but the form is supposed to be revisited it has not been so far.

Therefore, do you have a policy for hybrid courses or not? I am attaching the hybrid course approval form that was rejected.

3) I received a question about getting approval for a hybrid course in graduate studies. Graduate Council, by the way, is not in the bylaws. Therefore, I don't know who (what authority) Graduate Council reports to. Does it report to Faculty Senate? Why or why not? Should Graduate Council be in the Bylaws?

Since UUCC is "undergraduate" courses only, would any of its policies affect Graduate Council? Therefore, would the UUCC policy affect their process for pursuing a hybrid course?

4) What about the hybrid courses that are already in place? Does the moratorium affect them, or just new ones? How would UUCC have jurisdiction over existing courses that aren't changing?
Hybrid Course Proposal Form

Department/School: ________________________________

College: [ ] EMS [ ] BILSA [ ] LAE

Faculty or academic teaching staff: ________________________________

Course (acronym, number, name): ________________________________

Semester/year: ____________ Class meeting times: ____________

Refer to the Hybrid Course Policy from Faculty Senate (September 2013) before completing this form. When completed, submit this form to your department/school for consideration. If necessary, the form may be forwarded to the College Curriculum committee for consideration. When completed and approved, this form should be added to the syllabus file kept by the department and shared with the public upon request.

Recommended due dates: This form, with approvals, should be completed prior to advising each semester (roughly October 1 and March 1 each year).

Use as much space as necessary to answer thoroughly the questions below.

1) What is your pedagogical rationale for using alternative delivery methods instead of teaching face-to-face?

2) What is the percentage of time that alternative delivery methods will be used to replace face-to-face class time (i.e., 10 to 99% is considered a hybrid course)?

3) What will the pattern be of face-to-face meetings and alternative teaching methods (such as given number of times each week)?

4) What are the qualifications of the instructor to effectively utilize the alternative delivery method(s) for this course (e.g., list Teaching & Learning Center workshops by title/date attended; include experience with teaching online and/or in hybrid courses)? If none, this form should be forwarded by the department to the College Curriculum committee for consideration.
5) Which best practice, model, and/or resources provided by the Teaching & Learning Center relates to this hybrid course? [Sample assignments or activities utilized through alternative methods, instead of face-to-face teaching, could be described to answer this question.]

6) How will your use of alternative delivery methods be evaluated by students in this course?

Signatures:

Instructor ___________________________ Date ___________________________

This course is proposed as: [ ] overload  [ ] reduction in load  [ ] part of load

Approvals:

Department/School Chair ___________________________ Date ___________________________

This course is approved as: [ ] overload  [ ] reduction in load  [ ] part of load

Dean ___________________________ Date ___________________________

College Curriculum committee chair ___________________________ Date ___________________________

This course is approved as: [ ] overload  [ ] reduction in load  [ ] part of load

Refer to the Hybrid Course Policy from Faculty Senate (September 2013) before completing this form. When completed submit this form to your department/school for consideration. If necessary, the form may be forwarded to the College Curriculum committee for consideration. When completed and approved, this form should be added to the syllabus file kept by the department and shared with the public upon request.

Recommended due dates: This form, with approvals, should be completed prior to advising each semester (roughly October 1 and March 1 each year).