Dear Panel Members,

In late 2022, we received feedback from the ASC Curriculum Committee indicating that they would not vote on the proposal for the online versions of our High-Impact Practice: Interdisciplinary Team-Teaching course request for ENR/AEDE 2501 (both regular and honors embedded). The committee shared their concerns and a request for two main items to be addressed. The request from the committee is below in red, followed by our response in italics. We hope that with the additional clarifying detail we have provided, the committee will find this suitable for a vote and that these online versions of 2501 can be approved to complement the already approved in-person version of the course. We also want to note that the instructors have access to Kylienne Shaul, who was hired in SENR as an Instructional Development Specialist in 2014 and who has contributed to the development of a robust set of synchronous and asynchronous courses in our program. Her guidance has already been instrumental in developing the syllabi for the online sections of the course.

The Panel did not vote on the proposal as they would like the following feedback items addressed:

* The reviewing faculty thank the departments for their revisions, but they still do not find the course to meet the definition of the High-Impact Practice: Interdisciplinary Team-Teaching. Both instructors should be involved in all aspects of the course design. To this end, they would like to see the following feedback items addressed:
	+ As the reviewing faculty read the plan in the provided syllabus and cover letter, they did not see how the faculty would be interacting with each other in a direct way during the provided lecture videos. In order to be High-Impact, the faculty members should be making the videos together and interrogating the ideas presented by each discipline during these lecture videos, and should not simply be teaching in a co-teaching model. If this is taking place, it is not clear on the course syllabus, and the reviewing faculty ask that this be further clarified.

*We have provided additional explanation in the syllabus itself and, more importantly, have provided an appendix in which we more fully describe our approach to team teaching and how this course will function in an online environment. In short, each “lecture period” (for which there would be two in each weekly module) includes a combination of short (~12-15 minute) sub-lectures. Those sub-lectures will have three formats, (i) individual faculty providing disciplinary depth on a topic, (ii) co-lectures that will feature both faculty members providing different perspectives on the same topic and highlighting areas of overlap and divergence, and (iii) expert discussion in the format of an interview or podcast to synthesize material and discuss the topic in the context of the larger aims of the course. These different formats were not fully described in the previous submission and will mirror our in-person lectures for which both faculty members will be present and contributing. The number of co-lectures and expert discussions will constitute at least 50% of the total video lecture material that the students will view over the course of the semester. Please see the additional details in the syllabus in the section, “How this course works” as well as Appendix A*.

* + The reviewing faculty would like to see additional details regarding the new discussion board assignments. As it currently reads, it appears as if one of the two instructors involved with the course will be answering students in the discussion board. In order to be considered High-Impact, both instructors should be engaging with the discussion boards and having conversations with all students and each other in this forum, and ideally examining and interrogating the ideas of all disciplines being engaged in the course.

*The discussion forums will have a similar pattern to the lectures in that some discussions will be pertinent to one or the other instructors’ expertise while others, particularly toward the end of a weekly module or topic section will draw on and engage both instructors as students grapple with the multidisciplinary challenges of sustainability. In either case, both instructors will be engaged in the discussion boards, but in different ways.*

*Format I: This format will appear in the early portions of a module or section when a discussion is more pertinent to one instructor and the discipline-specific approach they are taking to a topic. Instructor A presents a lecture to provide depth of understanding on that topic through the lens of their discipline. Instructor B poses discussion questions designed to encourage students to think critically about that disciplinary approach and consider the implications of and alternatives to that approach. Instructor A then reads and comments on the students’ responses. This is flipped when Instructor B is presenting the content.*

*Format II: This format will appear in the latter portions of a weekly module and towards the end of each of our 5 main sections of the course as the students grapple with the multidisciplinary challenges of sustainability. These discussion questions will be jointly developed by both instructors and will be designed to encourage students to synthesize the material, compare and evaluate different perspectives and describe, for example, whether and how the different disciplinary perspectives would result in different solutions to the challenge at hand, and what the implications of this are for society, the environment, and the economy. In this format both instructors are reading and commenting on the students’ posts.*

*Overall, we believe this approach effectively introduces a topic, allows for coherent conveying of important disciplinary specific content, and provides an opportunity to grapple with the issue from varying perspectives.  The heavy reliance of the class on real world applications (HIP Element #7); Opportunities to reflect through discussion prompts (HIP Element #6); Diversity of perspectives and a clear attempt to illuminate differences (HIP Element #4), and the opportunity to hear from faculty directly or in parallel dialogue as well as directly via discussion forums (HIP #3) all combine to meet the High Impact expectations.*

* The reviewing faculty strongly recommend reaching out to Bill Putikka.1, faculty Chair of the ASCC Themes 2 Panel, to more thoroughly discuss the feedback of the Panel and their concerns.

*We appreciate the suggestion and were able to meet with Bill Putikka on zoom in early 2023. He provided excellent advice and guidance on the gaps in our material and how we might proceed.*

.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Brooks, Brent Sohngen, and Jeff Sharp