



COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

June 29, 2020

To: Dylan Rodriguez
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Abhijit Ghosh, Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: [Campus Review] Proposal: Committee on Courses proposed new General Rules and Policies Governing Courses of Instruction

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) has been asked to provide feedback on the proposed new General Rules and Policies Governing Courses of Instruction. The CFW met remotely on June 16, 2020 and discussed the documents provided. The new proposal for rules governing courses of instruction is very thorough and well documented. Generally, the committee could find few errors or points of major contention. There are, however, some important issues, as listed below, that CFW would like to draw attention to.

Definition of hybrid courses:

Page 9. "vi. Adding a course format (in-person, hybrid, online)"

CFW recommends changing to "Addition or change to a new course format (in-person, hybrid, online)". 'Adding' is not clear.

While in-person and online are clear, there needs to be a statement on what defines a hybrid course. Although more clearly defined on page 12, but what percentage of the course being taught in-person or online would require approval by C&C? Notably, many faculty already use flipped-classroom models. This might be interpreted as a hybrid course as might many other venues. The policy needs to be clear about what is necessary for requiring a new syllabus.

Status of fieldwork:

Page 32-4. 'Fieldwork' should be part of the 'Semi-contact activities' (section III.7.c). It fits the definition presented in this section, and equivalent to studio and laboratory for courses with field component(s). In such undergraduate courses, fieldwork is typically supervised by instructor

and/or TA. In the previous version of this policy, revised in May 2018, fieldwork is equivalent to studio and laboratory. It is not clear why it is demoted to 'Non-contact activities' in this proposed revision. Fieldwork should be categorized as 'Semi-contact activities'.

There are typos in the section numbers. 'III.7.d.ii' should be changed to 'III.7.c.iii'; 'III.7.d.iii' should be changed to 'III.7.c.iv'.

Page 12. CFW recommends adding 'fields' in the list of places for class activities considered as contact hours. For many courses in a number of disciplines like, earth sciences, anthropology, botany, environmental sciences, fieldwork is critical and typically supervised by instructor and/or TA.

Other issues:

Page 35. III.7.e "As faculty and Committee experience with online teaching tools increases, the activity types and coding of online teaching will be reviewed and updated."

CFW recommends changing "As" to "If". This is a choice, not an expected direction for faculty teaching.

Page 17. Why are 190 courses (special topics) not listed?

Page 22. Section II.3.b - states "See II.2.c", but it should be "II.2.d". CFW recommends checking all cross references in document.

Page 26. Section III.1.d.ii requires all courses accessing specific equipment and online resources identified in the course proposal and sample syllabus. Such equipment and online resources are subject to frequent updates and changes. For example, an instructor may decide to use a different and better software after two years. Would that require a course change application? In that case, CFW suspects that many current courses may require to apply for changes. It should be clarified.

Pages 40-42. Section IV.4 Priority Enrollment request by course

This section of the document needs to be rewritten to reflect the changes in our campus that revolve around impacted courses, offering transfer students opportunities for priority enrollment to complete their degree plan on time, and often lack of effective classroom space. Across the colleges, there is a general complaint that majors often are not getting access to the essential or required courses necessary to complete their degree on time. This is especially true of cross-listed courses where both majors and minors may be impacted. If a course is a requirement of the major, and more importantly, a gateway course to upper division courses for students within a major, there should be an easier means for setting aside a proportion of the seats for faculty to allocate as priority enrollment for impacted students.

The current model seems outdated to CFW.

IV.4: *"All Priority Enrollment requests require a special report, and are offered for 3 years maximum before review. Note that general enrollment priority, as for Honors Program students, requires review by the Committee on Educational Policy."*

It is unclear why this is a policy that must be formalized through C&C, and if it is, and approved, why there should be a need for review every three years.

IV.4.b: *"The justification for priority enrollment should not simply state that it is for enrollment management purposes or to create priority for students within the major."*

CFW feels that offering priority to students within the major is a strong justification for the Departments and Colleges. CFW recommends suitable revision of this part.

Related suggestions to consider:

a) For any class, a priority enrollment (PE) target of 15-20 percent can be designated as priority enrollment by a faculty member without having to notify C&C. This takes care of the few problematic cases.

b) For more than 15-20 percent priority, a justification for a higher PE must be submitted as per the guidelines outlined in IV.4.b. A higher percentage of PE are likely to have greater impact on students in minors or other programs, and we agree that a review of the need and percentage of PE requested should go through C&C.

c) Approved Priority enrollment is for a five-year limited duration, whereby subject to review and approval it may continue beyond the five-year period. [decrease the workload and get rid of the need for a new course proposal submission every three years]