



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA 92521-0132

November 30, 2018

TO: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
Academic Senate

FROM: Lucille Chia, Acting Chair
CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Provost's Taskforce for Hybrid and Online Education Final Report

This memo summarizes the points raised in the discussion of the Executive Committee of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences on the Provost's Taskforce for Hybrid and Online Education Final Report.

1. Questions about details in the report

--p. 4: How was it determined that "UCR should aim to put 50 courses online each year. . ."?
ditto for "UCR should aim to deliver about 25% of courses online"?

--Other than the need to "prioritize large and /or general education courses," who would determine which courses should be offered online? Is this mainly based on initiative from instructors, departments or programs? But would that not lead to possibly skewed distribution of online courses (e.g., one instructor or department wanting to offer more online courses)?

2. Teaching preparation

--p. 5 "**Work with willing faculty members and provide appropriate support and incentives.**"

--Certainly, financial support should include course buyout (that is, course release for new online course where appropriate. How to determine whether this is warranted: e.g., if instructor is teaching an online course for the first time, if the course is completely new (has not been taught as face-to-face course) or radically redesigned. Should relevant guidelines for faculty support and incentives be determined on a campus-wide basis, or would some guidelines be determined by the department/program or school?

--"**Clear ownership of intellectual property.**" (p. 5, 8 of report)

The report does warn against the school entering into agreements that would potentially create problems about intellectual property ownership, but this issue needs to be clearly thought out as early as possible, rather than later, when serious problems arise. The CHASS Executive Committee stressed the grave concern of faculty on this matter. The UCOP policy cited many need elaboration.

--In addition, what happens if an online course developed and initially taught by one instructor is taught later by another instructor? And if more than one instructor (in collaboration or sequentially) are involved in the course, how to determine intellectual property ownership?

3. TA concerns

--TA training for online courses is noted and described schematically in the report, but there are many other concerns, such as:

--some TAs prefer to work on online courses (by inclination; or they cannot or prefer not to be on campus, etc.):

--how to formulate equitable way of determining the amount of work compared that of a TA in a face-to-face course; similarly, how to evaluate and be able to compare the performance of the two kinds of teaching

--should TAs be allowed to work only for online courses while a graduate student at UCR, and if so, how may this affect their teaching experience and evaluations that may well be significant parts of their full cv when looking for jobs?

--What about the time needed to train a TA for teaching in an online course? Will this be considered part of the TA's teaching duties? Will the TA be compensated for this training time?

--The report notes that "online classes lead to larger course enrollments" (p. 11), but this may not be true, if more specialized online and hybrid courses are developed. Thus, if an online version of a course that is offered requires fewer TAs than the face-to-face version, how will this affect the TA positions that a department or program can offer? The financial implications need to be thought out in detail.

4. Teaching evaluations for online vs. face-to-face courses

--Report points out the necessity of adequate training for both the faculty and TAs preparing to teach an online course (p. 8, 11) and that teaching evaluations need to be redesigned to be equitable and useful for online and hybrid courses. The CHASS Executive Committee suggests that until these policies can be put fully into practice, careful distinction be made in using teaching evaluations for face-to-face and online courses for personnel actions.

In sum, the Provost's Taskforce for Hybrid and Online Education Final Report thoughtfully addresses many of the issues that concern the development of online courses at UCR. The CHASS Executive Committee had a lengthy discussion and this memo summarizes points raised in our discussion, and we stress that UCR faculty and administration should continue to monitor developments and draw guidance from the experiences in other institutions as they develop a program of online and hybrid courses.

Lucille Chia, Acting Chair

CHASS Executive Committee