



February 12, 2019

To: Wee Liang Gan
Chair, Committee on Courses

Paul Lyons
Chair, Committee on Educational Policy

From: Dylan Rodríguez, Chair
Riverside Division 

Re: Report from the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Remote Learning, “Hybrid”, and Online Courses

Dear Courses and CEP colleagues:

I am sending the attached document for your examination. Please consider the Charge for this Ad Hoc Committee (attached) as you read it and consider the implications for the campus and the fulfillment of its research and teaching mission. I ask that you engage in a conversation about any recommended (potential) revisions to the Remote Learning Guidelines that might derive from your committee’s study of this Report.

The next step is for the Academic Senate to communicate the Report and your committee feedback to the Provost. I ask that you please provide your committee’s comments on the Report by March 15, 2019. Thank you in advance for your work and thoughtfulness on this matter.

Peace.
dylan

cc: Beth Beatty, Senate Analyst

Report from Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Remote Learning, “Hybrid,” and Online Courses

Tom Stahovich, Chair (Mechanical Engineering)

Cecilia Ayón (School of Public Policy)

Ward Beyermann (Physics and Astronomy)

Bracken Dailey, Ex Officio (Registrar)

Elizabeth Davis (Psychology)

Cheryl Diermyer, Ex Officio (Academic Engagement, Center for Teaching and Learning)

Anthonia Kalu (Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages, Gender and Sexuality Studies)

Juliette Levy (History)

Morris Maduro (Molecular, Cell and Systems Biology)

Richard Seto (Physics and Astronomy)

Kambiz Vafai (Mechanical Engineering, Director of Online Master of Science Program)

The Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Remote Learning, “Hybrid,” and Online Courses was given the following charge:

- A clear definition of “hybrid” courses, and what differentiates them from online courses; this should include clarification of any additional information (especially regarding additional course materials and added costs) that will be passed on to students when they register for such courses.
- Clarification of whether and how the administration of exams in these courses may be delegated to online companies, and whether students will in turn be expected to bear the additional cost of such exam proctoring services.
- Any other matters the Committee deems germane to their charge, and which fall under the purview of the Academic Senate.

Pursuant to its charge, the committee held several meetings during the spring and fall of 2018. In its deliberations, the committee addressed the following issues:

- Criteria for evaluating the delivery mode of proposed courses
- Methods for determining the unit count for proposed courses
- Materials, supplies, and services required for a proposed course
- Test proctoring methods for online and hybrid courses
- Informing students of special requirements for courses with remote learning content

Definitions of In-Person, Online, and Hybrid Courses:

A course is a traditional *in-person* course if all of the assigned units are based on activities that occur in scheduled locations on campus. In current practice, activities accrue units as follows: One hour of lecture, discussion, seminar, workshop, or colloquium per week corresponds to one unit. Similarly, three hours of laboratory or studio per week correspond to one unit. For example, a 4-unit course with 3 hours of lecture scheduled in a lecture hall each week and 3 hours of laboratory scheduled in a campus teaching laboratory each week would be an *in-person* course.

For some courses, units are assigned for *independent work* such as additional reading, report writing, independent studies, independent research, and internships. If some of the units of a course are based on such *independent work*, and the remainder (if any) are based only on activities that occur in scheduled locations on campus, the course is an *in-person* course. For example, 190 (special studies), 197 (research for undergraduates), and 198 (internship) courses are considered *in-person* courses.

If a course is not considered to be an *independent study* course, and none of the units correspond to activities that occur in scheduled locations on campus, the course is an *online* course (i.e., fully online). A course can still be considered to be *online* if exams are held in scheduled locations, either on campus or elsewhere. Thus, test proctoring centers can be used without affecting the designation of a course as a fully *online* course.

If a course is neither an *in-person* nor an *online* course, it is a *hybrid* course. More specifically, a course is a *hybrid* course if some units accrue from activities that occur in scheduled locations on campus or from *independent work*, and others do not. For example, a 4-unit course with 1 hour of discussion scheduled in a room on campus each week, no *independent work*, and no other activities scheduled on campus would be a *hybrid* course.

For the purposes of these definitions, a course activity must be a required activity to be classified as a scheduled activity. For example, if the content for a course is delivered via a website, the instructor schedules optional instructional time in a lecture room on campus, and there are no other activities scheduled on campus, the course would be an *online* course. Conversely, a flipped class in which students were required to study material from a website before attending required on-campus lectures would be considered a traditional course.

Evaluating the Delivery Mode of a Proposed Course

All courses --- including traditional and remote learning courses --- taught at UC Riverside must provide high quality instruction. To enable the Committee on Courses to evaluate the quality of instruction of a proposed course, course proposals should include a description of the content to be taught and the manner by which it will be taught. The manner of teaching must be suitable for the subject matter. More specifically, all courses must provide suitable methods for delivering content, assessing student learning, providing feedback to students, adapting to students' needs, and enabling interaction between the instructors and students. Course proposals must address all five of these aspects of pedagogy and describe how the proposed methods are suitable.

There are a variety of methods for delivering course content. Examples include, but are not limited to, in-person lectures (i.e., traditional lectures), active classroom learning activities (e.g., a flipped classroom), static media (e.g., textbooks, non-interactive videos, and PDFs), and interactive media (e.g., interactive videos and intelligent tutoring systems). Courses may employ multiple methods of content delivery. All course proposals must describe how the methods used for content delivery are suitable for the subject matter. For example, static media might be suitable for a literature course, but might be less suitable for a course in dance. Similarly, active classroom learning activities might be suitable for a dance course, but less suitable for a large introductory psychology course with 500 students.

Assessing student learning, and providing feedback to students about their learning, are essential elements of effective instruction. Examples of methods of assessment include, but are not limited to, multiple choice questions, free response questions (e.g., mathematical problem-solving and written text), performances and presentations (e.g., dance and theater performances and scientific presentations), and projects (e.g., capstone projects). Examples of modes of feedback include, but are not limited to, scores on multiple choice problems, comments on answers to free response questions, critiques of performances and presentations, and critiques of projects. A course may employ multiple methods for assessment and feedback. All course proposals must describe how the methods used for assessing learning and providing feedback are suitable for the subject matter.

Because students vary in their abilities and preparation, instructors may have to adapt instruction to accommodate particular cohorts of students. For example, if a particular cohort of students lacks knowledge of a prerequisite topic, it may be necessary to provide additional instruction on that topic. There are a variety of methods for adapting a course to meet students' needs. Examples include, but are not limited to, adjustments to lecture content (e.g., adding additional content), adjustments to static media (e.g., adding additional handouts and readings), adjustments to active classroom learning activities, and the use of interactive media (e.g., intelligent tutoring systems). All course proposals must describe how suitable methods will be employed for adapting a course to meet students' needs.

Interaction between instructors and students is a cornerstone of a university education. Examples of methods of interaction include, but are not limited to, questions and answers during lecture, active classroom learning activities, in-person office hours, and electronic communication (e.g., discussion boards, video conferencing, and email.) All course proposals must describe how suitable methods will be employed to enable interaction between instructors and students.

Determining the Unit Count for a Proposed Course

The unit count for a course is governed by SR 760 that states that "the value of a course in units shall be reckoned at the rate of one unit for three hours' work per week per term on the part of a student, or the equivalent." In practice, the unit count for traditional in-person courses is often determined by the number of hours of scheduled activities such as lectures, discussion sections, and laboratory sections. However, this short-cut approach does not work for online and hybrid courses as many, if not all, of the activities are unscheduled. Instead, there are two recommended methods for determining the correct unit count for online and hybrid courses. The first method is by direct application of SR 760. Proposals employing this method should provide an estimate of the expected student workload. The second is by comparison to an existing course: If a new course covers the same content as an existing course (i.e., the

expected learning outcomes are the same), the new course should have the same unit count as the existing one. Proposals employing this method should include a comparison to the relevant traditional course.

Materials, Supplies, and Services Required for a Proposed Course.

Course proposals must include a description of any special materials, equipment, and services that students must obtain to take the course. Ordinary, course materials such as bluebooks, Scantron forms, textbooks, and course readers need not be listed. Examples of special items include: access to a high speed network connection, access to a computer, special software, use of a proctoring service (see below), subscriptions to media sources, laboratory equipment and supplies, and project supplies. Proposal should include the costs for such items.

Test Proctoring Methods for Online and Hybrid Courses.

The committee believes that tests for online and hybrid courses should be proctored to avoid the potential for academic misconduct. However, it is the committee's opinion that tuition-paying students should not be charged for the use of proctoring services. Tuition fees should provide students with full access to the courses in which they are enrolled. Just as it would be unreasonable to charge a room fee for a student enrolled in a course taught on campus, we believe that it is unreasonable to charge students for access to a testing facility or proctoring service. Additionally, teaching courses online may result in cost savings for the campus, as this could reduce or delay the need to construct new lecture halls to accommodate the projected growth of enrollment on campus. In light of this potential cost savings, imposing testing costs on students seems inappropriate.

Given these considerations, the committee recommends that proctoring fees be paid for by the Campus. Additionally, the committee recommends that consideration be given to developing an on-campus testing facility for use with online and hybrid courses. If an on-campus facility is available and a student chooses to instead use a proctoring service, it would be reasonable for the student to pay for that service.

If passing testing costs on to the students cannot be avoided, the committee believes that there should be an upper limit to the amount of fees a student must pay. Additionally, there must be a means to accommodate students who cannot pay for proctoring fees. A student that cannot afford the costs of proctoring should not be put at a disadvantage.

Note that this discussion concerns regularly enrolled students. For self-supporting programs like the Online Master of Science Program, it is reasonable for students to bear the costs for test proctoring.

Informing Students of Special Requirements for Courses with Remote Learning Content.

For courses with remote learning content, details of the remote delivery methods should be provided to students via the Schedule of Classes (<https://classes.ucr.edu/>). The information should be added to Banner before the schedule of classes is made live each term.

Currently, Banner's Schedule of Classes database provides a field titled "Final Exam and Schedule / Notes". This field should be used to describe the remote learning aspects of the course.

The “Final Exam and Schedule / Notes” field should be renamed to make its purpose more apparent. For example, “Final Exam and Schedule / Remote Learning Details / Notes” would be a more useful title.

The following information should be provided:

Content delivery

- Description of content delivery methods
- Costs for content (e.g., online textbook rental)
- Schedule (e.g., asynchronous or fixed schedule)

Interaction methods

- Description of methods for instructor / student interaction

Computing requirements

- Required hardware
- Required software
- Required network connection

Testing methods

- Proctoring fees
- Testing location
- Testing schedule

Other

- Any other special requirements



March 6, 2018

To: Sarjeet Gill
Chair, Committee on Committees

From: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
Riverside Division

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "DR", is placed over the name "Dylan Rodriguez" in the "From:" field.

Re: Charge for Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Remote Learning, “Hybrid,” and Online Courses

Dear Sarjeet:

I write to the Committee on Committees to request the formation of a 7-9 member Ad Hoc Committee on Remote Learning, “Hybrid,” and Online Courses, with membership drawn from across Colleges and Schools. I also recommend that a representative from the Registrar’s office and the Instructional Design Team be included on the Ad Hoc Committee as ex officio members. The fundamental purpose of this Committee is to provide rigorous feedback on the proposed revisions to the Guidelines for Remote Learning Courses (attached). In addition to offering input on the proposed revisions to the Guidelines, the Committee should consider providing an initial framework for best practices in implementing the courses that fall under the Remote Learning rubric.

Some of the Committee’s specific tasks within this overarching committee charge may include:

- A clear definition of “hybrid” courses, and what differentiates them from online courses; this should include clarification of any additional information (especially regarding additional course materials and added costs) that will be passed on to students when they register for such courses.
- Clarification of whether and how the administration of exams in these courses may be delegated to online companies, and whether students will in turn be expected to bear the additional cost of such exam proctoring services.
- Any other matters the Committee deems germane to their charge, and which fall under the purview of the Academic Senate.

In order to provide sufficient background context for the Committee’s work, i have attached the most recent version of the Committee on Courses’ Proposed Changes to Guidelines for Remote Learning Courses, as well as the co-authored memo from Committee on Courses (Courses) and Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) that discusses the need for this Ad Hoc Committee.


Importantly, the Provost/EVC is forming a parallel task force that will consider the administrative aspects of remote/hybrid/online courses. I have requested a draft of the Provost task force charge and it is attached.

Provost Larive and i agree that it will be beneficial to the overall consultation process if there is some strategic overlap between the membership of the Ad Hoc Senate Committee and the Provost's task force. Thus, i am suggesting that at least one member from Courses and CEP be assigned to the Ad Hoc Committee, after which the Provost will have the opportunity to assign those same members to the task force. Further, there are several Senate faculty with significant experience teaching online courses who may be appropriate considerations for the Ad Hoc Committee, including Juliette Levy (History), Ted Garland (EEOB), and Kambiz Vafai (Mechanical Engineering). The meeting expectations will likely be 1-2 times per month, and the Committee's work should be completed by June 2018.

Thank you as always for your work, CoC colleagues.

January 23, 2018

To: Dylan Rodríguez, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Wee Liang Gan, Chair 
Committee on Courses

Tim Paine, Chair 
Committee on Educational Policy

Re: Proposed Changes to Guidelines for Remote Learning Courses

The Committee on Courses and Committee on Educational Policy reviewed the comments from Executive Council and the Senate Review of the proposed changes to the Guidelines for Remote Learning Courses. Additionally, the Committees received several memos from Senate faculty who instruct online courses requesting consultation by the Committees as proposed changes are drafted. Due to the increase of online education at UCR and the UC System the Committees recommend that the Guidelines be significantly updated to include relevant best practices and guidance. In particular, some practical issues that need to be studied and addressed include:

- How to define a course as hybrid and what additional information if any should be made available to the students when they register for hybrid courses?
- When can instructors delegate proctoring of exams to online proctoring companies and make students pay for it, for example, are instructors of hybrid courses (those not fully online) allow to do that?
- What is the Registrar's protocol for hybrid courses that will only need rooms irregularly such as for exams?

The Committees recommend that a Special Senate Committee be formed to draft an updated document so that specialized and dedicated time can be allotted to the revision of the document. The Committees recommend that membership of the Special Committee include representatives from the Committee on Courses and Committee on Educational Policy, Senate Faculty with experience instructing online courses (Juliette Levy, Ted Garland, and Kambiz Vafai have all offered their assistance to draft the proposed changes), and a representative from each college and school. The Committees also recommends that the Registrar and member of the Instructional Design team serve on the Committee as ex officio members to provide consultation and their expertise. Attached to this memo is the Committee on Courses latest proposed changes to the Guidelines for Remote Learning Courses.

Att: Committee on Courses Proposed Changes to the Guidelines for Remote Learning Courses

GUIDELINES FOR REMOTE LEARNING COURSES
(Updated February 23, 2016)

[Proposed deletions marked with ~~strikethrough~~ Proposed additions marked with underline]

ORIGINAL DRAFT OF TEXT	PROPOSED VERSION
Preamble	
<p>It is the Committee on Educational Policy's interest to ensure that courses with a significant remote learning (RL) component are reviewed fairly and consistently by the Senate; accordingly the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) developed the guidelines below in collaboration with the Committee on Courses and Graduate Council. Either CEP or the Committee on Courses may modify or eliminate some of these guidelines as familiarity with remote learning (RL) courses develops and as best practices in the structure and delivery of RL courses are determined and generally adopted; it is to be expected that such modifications will be adopted after a consultation between these two committees in order to insure consistency. These guidelines are not offered as possible changes in the regulations or committee charges.</p>	<p>It is the Faculty Senate's intention to ensure that courses with a significant remote learning (RL) component are reviewed fairly and consistently by the Senate; accordingly the Committee on Educational Policy and the Committee on Courses, as provided in the previous version, have updated these guidelines, because familiarity with remote learning (RL) teaching methods has grown, and best practices in the structure and delivery of RL and hybrid courses have emerged. These guidelines are not offered as possible changes in the regulations or committee charges.</p>
<p>In considering RL courses the CEP has assumed that once the Senate through the Committee on Courses has approved a course, it has passed the necessary scrutiny to ensure that the expected quality of instruction will be delivered. For the same reason, any instructor approved to give such a course is assumed to have the necessary expertise and should be given all the freedom to modify his/her methods of instruction. Based on this the CEP believes that RL courses should not be associated with a particular instructor, nor with particular choices of software or hardware. In addition, the Committee considers that the repeat policy should apply to courses</p>	<p>In considering RL and hybrid courses, the Committee on Courses is charged with conducting the necessary scrutiny to ensure that the expected quality of instruction will be delivered. Any instructor approved to give such a course is assumed to have the necessary expertise and should be given all the freedom to modify his/her methods of instruction. Consequently, RL and hybrid courses should not be associated with a particular instructor, nor with particular choices of platform, software or hardware.</p>

with equivalent syllabi independently of their being traditional or RL.	
This document does not deal with some thorny issues surrounding RL courses, such as revenue sharing and intellectual property. This is not done with the intention to minimize these important concerns, but because they lie well outside the scope of both the Committee on Courses and the CEP.	This document does not deal with some thorny issues surrounding RL <u>and hybrid</u> courses, such as revenue sharing and intellectual property. This is not done with the intention to minimize these important concerns, but because they lie well outside the scope of both the Committee on Courses and the CEP.
Guidelines for the approval of Remote Learning courses	Guidelines for the approval of Remote Learning courses
<i>Definition</i>	<i>Definition</i>
	<u>The definition of course type (in-person, hybrid, online) depends on the configuration of the course's contact hours.</u>
A course shall be labeled remote-learning (RL) or online if in person contact with an instructor represents less than 1/3 of the total hours of required work per week.	A course shall be identified as remote-learning (RL) or online if <u>all</u> contact hours (including examinations) are not collocated on campus, but rely on any technological platform that connects students and instructors without requiring their presence in the same physical space.
A course shall be labeled hybrid if 1/3 to 2/3 of the lectures for the course are offered online.	Hybrid courses are those in which <u>some</u> contact hours are not collocated.
Though this will be the general definition of RL courses, both CEP and the Committee on Courses recognize that there may be cases where this will be inappropriate; the ultimate determination of whether a course is to be considered RL will be made by the Committee on Courses, and may be at variance with the above definition.	Though this will be the general definition of RL <u>and hybrid</u> courses, both CEP and the Committee on Courses recognize that there may be cases <u>in the future that require additional discussion.</u>
SR 760 associates one unit for 3 hours of work per week per term. It is understood, however, that a minimum of two hours of outside reading or other preparation is expected each week for each hour of lecture, seminar, consultation, or discussion. The general definition implies that a course with N units will be an RL course if it has fewer than N contact	SR 760 associates one unit for 3 hours of work per week per term. <u>One unit of credit is assigned for each hour of contact (which includes lecture, seminar, consultation, workshop, colloquium, and discussion.) UC expectations are that that a minimum of two hours of outside preparation is expected for each contact hour of contact. One unit of credit is also assigned for <i>three</i></u>

<p>hours/week in the same physical location. For example, a 4-unit course for which the total amount of contact hours in the same physical location lecture plus discussion plus seminar plus workshop plus laboratory time is less than 4 hours/week, would be an RL course. It is presumed (and verified in the course proposal during the Committee on Courses review) that all additional required contact between students and instructor(s) occurs remotely. The guidelines below are intended, in part, to insure that this type of contact will allow students to interact with the instructors.</p>	<p><u>hours of other assigned activity (e.g., term paper, extra reading, film screening, and other categories.)</u></p> <p><u>RL activities may count either as contact hours or non-contact hours depending on their design. Courses, however, are defined as RL or hybrid only if some of their scheduled <i>contact</i> hours take place via digital or remote platforms. Thus, a course with 4 hours of contact (lecture, discussion), but in which fewer than four hours take place with an instructor and student(s) gathered in the same physical location, has an RL component. The guidelines below are intended, in part, to ensure that remote contact hours are suitably designed to allow students to interact with the instructors.</u></p>
	<p><u>The Committee emphasizes that students <i>must</i> be informed clearly and in advance of registration about the nature of both online and in-person activities for any class. For example, an online course that requires students to appear for an examination on the UCR campus is not 100% online. Any non-remote requirements in a proposed course must be clearly outlined in the course proposal, and announced in the registration materials every time the course is offered.</u></p>
<p><i>Catalog Description</i></p>	<p><i>Catalog Description</i></p>
<p>Courses with standard and RL offerings are considered equivalent. Course proposals with RL as a possible delivery mode should include a sample course syllabus for RL delivery in lieu of or in addition to a syllabus for traditional delivery and should include the appropriate requests for repeatability. Courses, such as many lab courses, where physical interaction is an important aspect of the course, are presumptively not equivalent if offered in a RL format.</p>	<p><u>Courses offered through standard, hybrid, and RL delivery are considered equivalent. Course proposals with RL or hybrid as possible delivery modes should include a sample course syllabus for RL or hybrid delivery in lieu of or in addition to a syllabus for traditional delivery. <u>RL and hybrid course proposals should include appropriate information on repeatability, overlap, and other course characteristics.</u></u></p> <p><u>Courses, such as many lab, studio, and performance courses, where physical interaction is an important aspect of the</u></p>

	course, are presumptively not equivalent if offered in a RL format. <u>Proposals for such courses with RL components should explicitly address the issues involved, including in proposal, syllabus, and justifications</u>
Departments wishing to treat RL and traditional delivery courses as non-equivalent are advised to number the courses uniquely and to use the overlap statement to prevent credit being given for both delivery formats.	Departments wishing to treat RL, hybrid, or traditional delivery courses <u>that cover overlapping content</u> as non-equivalent are advised to <u>use different numbers for the traditional and RL courses</u> , and to use the overlap statement to prevent credit being given for both delivery formats.
All RL catalog course entries should include:	All RL <u>and hybrid syllabuses</u> [?] should include:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A broad description of the blend of traditional and online activities for the course. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A broad description of traditional and online activities for the course. <u>Course activities that are required to be carried out at a specific location (including examinations) must be clearly identified in a hybrid proposal, and in catalog/registration materials.</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whenever pertinent, a note indicating that some specialized hardware and/or software might be required, referring the students to the course syllabus for specific descriptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whenever pertinent, a note indicating that specialized hardware and/or software might be required, referring the students to the course syllabus for specific descriptions
<i>Approval</i>	<i>Approval</i>
All RL courses require separate approval of the RL syllabus by the Committee on Courses even if there is an approved traditional course with the same course content.	All courses <u>that a department wishes to begin teaching using an RL or hybrid format</u> require separate approval of the RL <u>or hybrid</u> syllabus by the Committee on Courses, <u>even if an approved traditional course with the same course content has already been approved.</u>
In considering approval of RL course proposals, the Committee on Courses shall be primarily focused on whether or not the RL course will provide quality of education	In considering approval of RL <u>and hybrid</u> course proposals, the Committee on Courses shall be primarily focused on whether or not the RL course will provide

at the level required by UC. The Committee shall be mindful that the goal of such courses is to provide access to more students who are UC qualified; neither possible reduction of graduation time, nor revenue advantages, shall be of relevance in the approval process.	quality of education at the level required by UC. The Committee shall be mindful that the goal of such courses is to provide access to more students who are UC qualified; neither possible reduction of graduation time, nor revenue advantages, shall be of relevance in the approval process.
Given the absence of generally accepted best practices for remote instruction, the Committee on Courses may opt to initially approve a course or syllabus with the RL format only for a defined period of time, with a favorable review required before granting unrestricted approval. The Committee on Courses may require RL course proposals to provide details not required of traditional courses.	<u>Because of the ongoing evolution in technology and best practices in this area,</u> the Committee on Courses may require RL <u>and hybrid</u> course proposals to provide details not required of traditional courses.
Any substantial modification in the delivery or evaluation methods including changes from one mode to another in an RL course should require separate approval by the Committee on Courses even if the content matter is left unaltered.	[suggest deletion]
When RL courses are proposed in degree programs that are subject to accreditation by external agencies (such as the ABET accreditation for Engineering programs), it is the responsibility of the department/program to ensure that the external agency will accept the RL courses in the accreditation process.	When RL <u>or hybrid</u> courses are proposed in degree programs that are subject to accreditation by external agencies (such as the ABET accreditation for Engineering programs), it is the responsibility of the department/program to ensure that the external agency will accept the RL courses in the accreditation process.
<i>Evaluation</i>	<i>Evaluation</i>
In consultation with the college executive committees, the CEP and Committee on Courses will modify the course evaluation form (ieval) to include items specific to RL courses. These committees will review and update this form every 5 years or earlier if needed.	In consultation with the college executive committees, the CEP and Committee on Courses will modify the course evaluation form (iEval) to include items specific to RL <u>and hybrid</u> courses. These committees <u>should</u> review and update <u>the way we conduct student evaluations of RL courses</u> every 5 years or earlier if needed.
<i>Suggested Guidelines to the Committee on Courses</i>	<i>Suggested Guidelines to the Committee on Courses</i>

<p>The following provide a list of points that the Committee on Courses may want to consider when evaluating RL course proposals. Not all points are relevant in all cases and additional ones might be raised for specific instances.</p>	<p>The following <u>section provides</u> a list of points that the Committee on Courses <u>considers</u> when evaluating RL <u>and hybrid</u> course proposals. Not all points are relevant in all cases, and additional ones <u>may</u> be raised for specific instances.</p>
<p>All RL course proposals should:</p>	<p>All RL <u>and hybrid</u> course proposals should:</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conform to the standard schedules of 10-week offerings during the academic year, or 10/5/3 week for the Summer session; the Committee on Courses can consider alternative scenarios under exceptional circumstances on a case-by-case basis. Any proposal to allow students to take evaluations at different times during the term must also include workable plans to maintain the integrity of the evaluations (see also next bullet) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conform to the standard schedules of 10-week offerings during the academic year, or 10/<u>7</u>/5/3 <u>weeks</u> for the Summer session; the Committee on Courses can consider alternative scenarios under exceptional circumstances on a case-by-case basis.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a clear description of the <u>evaluation</u> methods including the measures aimed at preventing student dishonesty (especially if online examinations are proposed). In addition, electronic assessment tools must be designed/chosen to ensure sufficient variation in the evaluation instruments from offering to offering so that the availability of tests from previous offerings does not compromise future evaluations. As students may be less likely to cheat on low-stakes exams than on high-stakes exams, evaluation of student learning should be designed to use several smaller, rather than fewer weightier, examinations. Fees for remote proctoring services should be included on the course syllabi, when remote proctoring is required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a clear description of <u>student assessment</u> methods <u>that will be employed</u>, including the measures aimed at preventing student dishonesty (especially if online examinations are proposed). <u>When remote proctoring is required</u>, fees for remote proctoring services should be included on the course syllabi.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guarantee student access to the instructor in charge of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guarantee student access to the instructor in charge of the course.

<p>course. Access to the instructor cannot be delegated to any sort of assistant. The course description should include the frequency, duration and manner of such contact hours. Similarly, the number and manner of TA contact hours should be included in the course description.</p>	<p><u>All RL and hybrid courses must provide for direct student access to the instructor, which may not be delegated (but which may take place online, preferably with video support).</u> The course description should include the frequency, duration and manner of such contact hours. Similarly, the number and manner of TA contact hours (<u>if the course will have TAs</u>) should be included in the course description.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make all reasonable accommodations to ensure course access for students with disabilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make all reasonable accommodations to ensure course access for students with disabilities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rely on generally available hardware since requiring cutting-edge technology will disadvantage some students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rely on generally available hardware since requiring cutting-edge technology will disadvantage some students.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that all relevant material available to students residing at or near UCR is also available to all RL students; this includes library material available electronically. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that all relevant material available to students residing at or near UCR is also available to all RL <u>and hybrid</u> students; this includes library material available electronically.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that all software issues (availability, licensing, etc.) should be resolved prior to the beginning of the term. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that all <u>platform</u> issues (availability, licensing, etc.) <u>are</u> resolved prior to the beginning of the term.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specify all software and hardware requirements, and the manner in which course-specific items can be obtained. This information should be included in the syllabus. 	<p>Specify all software and hardware requirements, and the manner in which course-specific items can be obtained. This information should be included in the syllabus.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the technical support available to students on and off campus. This should include the option of dial-in support and not be restricted to online support (so as not to disadvantage students whose 	<p>Describe the technical support available to students on and off campus (which should extend beyond online support). This information should be included in the syllabus.</p>

<p>computer is non functional). This information should be included in the syllabus.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that all TAs are trained in the software and hardware to be used in the course. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that all TAs are trained in the software and hardware to be used in the course.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a built-in mechanism for assessing learning outcomes. Assessment should measure the effectiveness of learning in a course, should be used to guide improvement in the course, and, when a comparable regular course is taught in parallel, may enable comparison of the relative effectiveness of the RL and the regular course. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Provide a mechanism for assessing course learning outcomes, if the department involved performs learning outcomes assessment at the course level.</u> Assessment should measure the effectiveness of learning in a course, should be used to guide improvement in the course, and, when a comparable regular course is taught in parallel, may enable comparison of the relative effectiveness of the RL and the regular course.
<p><i>In addition:</i></p>	<p><i>In addition:</i></p>
<p>Courses with a laboratory component require special attention. If the laboratory requires physical components, the simplest solution is to decouple the laboratory into a separate course that is taught on-site. Budget constraints, however, might force a choice between an online laboratory and no laboratory at all; such situations must be treated on a case-by-case basis weighing the advantages and problems of the proposal.</p>	<p>Courses with a laboratory, <u>studio, or performance</u> component require special attention. If the laboratory, <u>studio, or performance</u> requires physical components, <u>one possibility may be</u> to decouple the laboratory, <u>studio, or performance</u> into a separate course that is taught on-site.</p>
<p>Teaching assistants should not be limited to RL courses but should also gain experience by serving in regular courses. A TA must alternate serving in an RL course with serving in two regular offerings except in cases where the TA requests to be assigned to RL courses more frequently.</p>	<p>[suggest deletion]</p>

<p>The Committee on Courses recommends that every remote learning course offered by UCR be supported by weekly, faculty-initiated, substantive interaction between student and instructor. The times and dates for these interactive sessions should be indicated clearly in the syllabus, and should be offered in addition to regular office hours.</p>	<p>The Committee on Courses recommends that every course offered by UCR <u>that includes remote contact hours be designed to ensure regular</u> faculty-initiated, substantive interaction between student and instructors (<u>which may include Teaching Assistants</u>). The times and dates for these interactive <u>elements</u> should be indicated clearly in the syllabus, and should be offered in addition to regular office hours.</p>
<p>By substantive interaction we mean learning activities that are directly dependent on faculty presence and that effect learning outcomes. The interaction must be academic, not administrative. Activities that are considered substantive include:</p>	<p>By substantive interaction we mean learning activities that are directly dependent on faculty presence and that effect learning outcomes. The interaction must be academic, not administrative.</p>
<p>o — Comment based grading that provides feedback that promotes a deeper understanding of the course topics.</p>	<p>[suggest deletion of entire list, which is problematic]</p>
<p>o — Live video conferences in which faculty meet with students for discussion of course content.</p>	<p>[suggest deletion]</p>
<p>o — Discussion board posts and blogs that engage course content.</p>	<p>[suggest deletion]</p>
<p>o — Academic, comment-based feedback on student journals, blogs and wikis that are part of the course.</p>	<p>[suggest deletion]</p>
<p>NOTE: Pre-recorded lectures and presentations do not count as substantive interaction.</p>	<p>[suggest deletion]</p>
<p>Approvals:</p>	
<p>Approved by the Committee on Courses: April 17, 2017</p>	

Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: May 5, 2017	
--	--

February 22, 2018

To: Umar Mohideen, Divisional Dean for Physical Sciences
Fr: Cynthia K. Larive, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
Re: Taskforce for Hybrid and Online Education – **REVISED**

Dear Umar,

Thank you for agreeing to chair the Taskforce for Hybrid and Online Education. As we discussed previously, this taskforce will produce recommendations about a hybrid/online curriculum strategy for UCR. My specific charge to the committee is to opine on the following questions and issues:

1. What are the main motivations for pursuing more hybrid/online instruction and what are the associated benefits that UCR stands to gain?
2. What should be our goals for the next 3-5 years?
3. What should be our strategy to achieve those goals? In particular, how should we organize ourselves? What, if any, additional staffing and technology needs are anticipated? What kinds of space and financial resources are anticipated?
4. **Which courses (or types of courses) should be prioritized for hybrid/online development?**
5. Other issues the taskforce deems important for establishing a coherent hybrid/online strategy for our campus.

In addition to your appointment as chair, I also am inviting Interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Rich Cardullo, Associate Provost Ken Baerenklau, UNEX Dean Kevin Vaughn, and UIA Fellow Joey Mavity to serve on this taskforce. I ask that you invite 2-3 more faculty from multiple colleges who have experience with hybrid/online instruction, such as Professors Juliette Levy (CHASS), Ted Garland (CNAS), and Cecilia Ayón (SPP). I also will request **3-4 nominations** from the Academic Senate, giving the committee **10-12 members** in total. I request that the committee submit its recommendations to me in writing no later than June 8, 2018.

Thank you again for your service and I look forward to receiving the committee's recommendations.