**Syllabus Standardization and Access**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Name** | Syllabus Standardization and Access | | | |
| **Executive Sponsor\*** | Sarah Mangelsdorf, Provost | | | |
| **Project Manager** | Steve Cramer, VP for Teaching and Learning | | | |
| **Primary Stakeholder(s)** | Students  Faculty and Instructors  Provost’s Office  Secretary of the Faculty | | | |
| **Project Description / Statement of Work** | | | | |
| This project will develop recommendations, standards and/or draft policies concerning the content and availability of course syllabi. | | | | |
| **Business Case / Statement of Need** | | | | |
| A course syllabus should minimally convey to students course topics and learning goals, how course-learning resources are available, how assessments are conducted, expectations of students enrolled in the course, the number of credits awarded and how achieved, and information about the course instructor(s). In essence, it conveys course expectations, serves as a durable record of the learning experience, and is a tool to support student learning. Currently there are no recommendations, standards or clear expectations of the content and availability of a course syllabus on the UW-Madison campus. As a result, there is wide variability ranging from excellent and detailed course syllabi to none at all. Typically, the course syllabus is not available to the student until the first day of class where upon they may find the course is not what they expected with little or no time to make a course schedule change.  There are many reasons for correcting this situation including student satisfaction, successful course completion, instructor protection, and accreditation compliance. | | | | |
| **Customers** | **Impacted Areas** | | | |
| Students | Course enrollment and completion | | | |
| Faculty and other instructors | Course preparation and design | | | |
|  |  | | | |
| **Project Definition** | | | | |
| **Project Goals** | 1. Establish minimum information to be conveyed via the syllabus and other optional information areas that are situation dependent 2. Identify automated means to populate portions of the syllabus to minimize instructor impact 3. Recommend timing around syllabus availability to students and means to store and archive course syllabi 4. Recommend the route to adoption and implementation via recommendations, standards, policies and other communications | | | |
| **Project Scope** | * Credit instruction at UW-Madison | | | |
| **Out of Scope** | * Noncredit instruction | | | |
| **Project Deliverables** | * Achievement of the project goals as enumerated above | | | |
| **Project Assumptions** | | | | |
| We agree that the syllabus is a durable document that describes the learning experience delivered in a given class, consistent with the catalog specifications associated with the course. It may be required at a future time for a student to answer questions about their learning experience, for transfer credit, for graduate or professional school, for employment, and so on.  The syllabus is a communication tool primarily for the benefit of students, and thus should be a student-centered document. It also provides documented protection for instructors when students don’t meet expectations that were identified in the syllabus. | | | | |
| **Implementation Plan / Milestones** | | | | |
| Committee recommendations by November  Implementation at some level by Spring 2018. | | | | |
| **Communication Plan** | | | | |
| To Who? | | From Who? | Frequency? | What? |
| Sponsor | | Project Manager |  |  |
| Faculty, instructional staff and governance groups | | Committee | Depends on plan | Depends on plan |
| **Change Management / Issue Management** | | | | |
| Final decisions are made by the executive sponsors or designees.  Voting scale is:   * Support/agree * Pros/cons exist, but can ‘go along’ with the group decision. * Do not support/agree   In the event a decision is made, but an individual does not support the decision, that individual will have the opportunity to document the reason for not supporting the decision. This information will be shared with the executive sponsors. This applies to both advisory and voting members. | | | | |
| **Project Team Roles and Responsibilities** | | | | |
| *Team Member* | *Role* | | *Decision-Making* | |
| Steve Cramer | Project Manager | | Voting Member only in case of absence or tie | |
| Doug Wiegmann |  | | Voting Member | |
| Anja Wanner |  | | Voting Member | |
| Ivy Corfis |  | | Voting Member | |
| Clark Landis |  | | Voting Member | |
| Mary Thompson |  | | Voting Member | |
| Michelle Young |  | | Advisory Member | |
| Jocelyn Milner |  | | Advisory Member | |
| **Approval of Charter** | | | | |
| *Executive Sponsor*  *Provost Sarah Mangelsdorf* | | *Signature* | | *Date* |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version Control** | | | |
| *Version* | *Name* | *Change/Comment* | *Date* |
| 062717 | Steve Cramer | First draft | 062717 |
| 082817 | Steve Cramer | Changes based on committee recommendations | 082817 |