November 10, 2022

Susan Cochran, Chair, Academic Council  
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

RE: [Systemwide Senate Review] Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 630

Dear Susan,

The Riverside Executive Council discussed the subject regulation amendment during their November 7, 2022 meeting and have no feedback or questions to put forth in addition to what is attached from local Senate committees.

Sincerely yours,

Sang-Hee Lee  
Professor of Anthropology and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Monica Lin, Executive Director of the Academic Senate  
Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of UCR Academic Senate Office
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

October 10, 2022

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
    Riverside Division

From: Lorenzo Mangolini, Chair
      Committee on Educational Policy

RE: Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 630

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) reviewed the proposed revision to Senate Regulation 630 at their October 7, 2022 meeting. The Committee noted that the proposed six units of course credits effectively requires the students to take two courses, for a total of eight units of course credits. The Committee recommends that the proposal be updated to provide additional clarification on whether the requirement will be applied during each quarter or distributed over three quarters.
October 8, 2022

TO:    Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
       Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

FROM:  John Kim, Chair
       CHASS Executive Committee

RE:     Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 630 on Residency Requirements

The CHASS Executive Committee reviewed the Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 630 on Residency Requirements at its October 6, 2022, regular meeting.

We affirm the spirit of the proposal in that a meaningful educational experience for our students is best attained when students are on campus interacting with their instructors and fellow students in-person.

However, we would like a justification for why only 50% of instructional hours should be in-person. Several members of the committee felt that this percentage could be higher unless there is a clear justification for 50%.
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION

October 13, 2022

To: Sang-Hee Lee
   Chair, Riverside Division

From: Kathleen Montgomery, Chair
   Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: [Systemwide Review] (Proposed Regulation Change) Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 630

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction reviewed the Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 630 and finds the proposed revisions consistent with senate code.
October 30, 2022

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Division Chair of the UCR Division of the Academic Senate and Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of the UCR Academic Senate

From: Raquel M. Rall, Ph.D., Faculty Chair of the School of Education Executive Committee

Subject: Proposed Regulation Change- Proposed Amendment to State Regulation 630

The SOE Executive Committee reviewed the Proposed Regulation Change- Proposed Amendment to State Regulation 630 and discussed any comments/feedback at our executive committee meeting on October 25, 2022. Additional comments were also received via email.

While overall, we understand the purpose of the amendment, we want to make sure to note that online courses are an important avenue for completion for marginalized populations. Many of our commuting students, returning students, student parents, low-income students, etc., leverage and maximize online courses in order to ensure they are able to keep various parts of their lives in “balance”. With the investment in online education and the improvement of online courses, there may be a way for students to effectively complete their requirements as long as there is an online path available to them. Data should be taken and used to inform any further amendments to see the ways that changes may help or hinder degree attainment.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Sincerely,

Raquel M. Rall, Ph.D.
Faculty Executive Committee Chair 2022-2025
School of Education
University of California, Riverside
October 31, 2022

TO: Sang-Hee Lee, Ph.D., Chair, Academic Senate, UCR Division
FROM: Marcus Kaul, Ph.D., Chair, Faculty Executive Committee, UCR School of Medicine
SUBJECT: Response to [Systemwide Review] Proposed Regulation Change: Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 630

Dear Sang-Hee,

The SOM Faculty Executive Committee has reviewed the Proposed Regulation Change: Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 630.

The Committee discussed the value of in-person instruction. The proposed regulation will enforce guidelines where a department cannot flip to an online only program. There is a need for guidelines for hybrid and flipped classrooms. The proposed regulation will define and characterize how the course is built and define in-person instruction for students.

The Committee approved the proposed regulation change and have no additional comments.

Yours sincerely,

Marcus Kaul, Ph.D.
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee School of Medicine
TO: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
Riverside Division

FR: Richard M. Carpiano, Chair
Executive Committee, School of Public Policy

RE: [Systemwide Review] Proposed Regulation Change: Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 630

Date: October 31, 2022

The Executive Committee of the School of Public Policy reviewed the documents for “[Systemwide Review] Proposed Regulation Change: Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 630.”

We have no comments.

Sincerely,

Richard M. Carpiano, Ph.D., M.P.H.
Professor of Public Policy
November 2, 2022

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
    Riverside Division

From: Peter M. Sadler, Chair
       Committee on Undergraduate Admissions

Re: Systemwide Review - Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 630 (Residency)

The Committee on Undergraduate Admissions reviewed the proposed addition to Senate Regulation 630 (Residency) at their October 21, 2022, meeting and is generally supportive of the proposed changes. SR 630E has become a necessary addition to clarify residency, considering the potentially increasing role of remote courses.

Matters of residency are not central to the mandate of the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions. Members accepted the merits of in-person instruction and group synergy. Members’ individual concerns about remote courses varied with their own experience of different course components. Although lecture sections have been successfully offered in remote mode, it is harder to offer remote laboratory and field sections that meet the intent of the in-person course as initially approved. In-person laboratory or field components may be essential to acceptance of some degree programs (e.g. geology, engineering) by state boards of registration and professional accreditation organizations.

Not all existing “in-person” courses would necessarily have been approved with the 630E stipulation that 50 percent of instruction hours be in-person and in-residence. How are we to evaluate individual senior theses, for example, in which students investigate remote field locations?

There was concern that the amended regulation intended to prohibit on-line degree programs. The intent is surely more limited -- to prevent stealthy, course-by-course approaches to that end. Perhaps the amended language should refer to a regulation that stipulates the proper pathway to approval of new degree programs.

The amendment was proposed with essential and expanded explanations of several key phrases, including “are designed to,” and “instructional hours.” Will such notes accompany the amended regulation 630?