

# AGENDA

Item	Lead	Desired Outcome	Notes and Actions
1. Welcome	Sue Kloosterman		
2. De-Brief Winter 2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PAC questions</li> </ul>	David Baker Deb Holts	Shared understanding of lessons learned Review – of PAC meeting C/O comments	<p><b>Outstanding outlines:</b> About ½ are approval related will action that with Chairs</p> <p><b>Action–</b> Laurel – send email to Deans and Chairs, Robin – re ESL</p> <p><b>Google Analytics:</b> portal – 20,000 – winter 1151 18,000 – have looked back to 2005                      SOCI 36 – most action on portal                      Some improvement on previous years</p> <p>Laurel – received <b>feedback on PAC</b> – by student who had several issues with C/O                      Deb – followed up – all course outlines were available except for one that had a course code change</p> <p>Part of answer is to problem solve ahead of time and take the dates off so a current date will not show for the course that will be taught within the future semester- will other institutions approve CO without dates –  <b>Action item:</b> take offline for discussion, bring either proposed or solution to next meeting.</p> <p>Whose name goes on it – the one who “prepared by”  <b>Action item:</b> take offline for discussion and solution investigation – cross check – manual one at this time.</p>
3. Testing with Faculty results	David Baker All	Understanding of system tweaks needed	<p>Amalgamated annual and semester outlines                      Tested by faculty – caught 2 bugs – made changes – recommended going forward – 6 faculty tested – Will update training documents.</p> <p><b>Decision</b> made to migrate</p>
4. Academic Council Draft Survey	Thom Luloff David Baker	Agreement on content and timing	<p>Kris reported <b>Academic Council Feedback</b> –9 respondents from about 20 A/C members</p> <p>Some feedback:</p>

			<p>C/O is for students when approved, but for faculty when designing their course.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Varying responses on when students should have access</li> <li>• Variance when faculty should complete this –</li> <li>• Some ideas on how to improve process and tools</li> <li>• Increased consistency</li> <li>• Clarifying content required</li> </ul> <p><b>AC draft survey to March 18</b> – finalized for survey</p> <p><b>Purpose for survey –</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify important content</li> <li>2. who is the end user</li> <li>3. when do we evaluate and update – what is actually being used on CO -</li> </ol> <p>- this will help in template design</p> <p>FDR– to receive draft next week  -survey will be sent out after reading break  – get data back to us back to April 10</p> <p><b>Discussion</b>  What is a nice to have and what is required  List mandatory items and then add other items which are nice to have and survey students to see other pieces of content</p> <p><b>Decision</b> – Thom, Kris and David update survey and move to next steps</p> <p>Two surveys - Student version and Faculty/Admission version</p>
<b>5. Course Outline Policy Documentation</b>	David Baker Sue Kloosterman All	Begin	<p>Would include standardized content required  Need academic policy, clarity and consistent  Needs to be sequential.</p> <p><b>Decision</b>  All COG members will review policies from AO website C/O – please send back parts of others that you like and give feedback so we can begin to develop a policy/process.</p>
<b>6. User Experience</b>	David Baker Laurie Twomey	Review of Changes requested Agreement on Process for enhancement prioritization	<p>Set up a group to go through the process and review the process with a view to make it a better experience.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> move forward with UX group David and Laurie</p>
<b>7. Other Business</b> • Agenda items	Sue/All	Clarity on Work ahead	<p><b>Decision</b>  Membership – will add one more faculty member to COG-</p>