INTRODUCTION

The Ad Hoc Committee met nine times between January and June of 2005 to discuss the questions posed by the charge letter from Academic Senate Chair Kathy Komar dated December 17, 2004. (Appendix A) Invited guests included Jim Davis, Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technology; Larry Loeher, Associate Vice Provost and Director of the Office of Instructional Development; and Robert Lapiner, Dean of University Extension.

Although the questions posed to the Ad Hoc Committee were specific, the very nature of this subject required an extensive investigation into a number of related areas. Beyond the issues of technology, which tend to dominate discussions of Online Instruction, many other equally vital topics under discussion range from academic philosophy to the actual hardware and software in use for the delivery of online material. With so many interconnected aspects to Online Instruction, the Ad Hoc Committee found itself peeling away layers of the metaphorical onion only to discover the layers had all been glued together. Approaches to pedagogy within a discipline, the place of instructional technology within that pedagogy, the embracing or outright fear of technology within an academic discipline, administrative support of teaching innovation, potential revenue generating schemes, and many other such issues where all identified as relevant to the Ad Hoc Committee’s deliberations.

With Online Instruction tapping into so many different aspects of UCLA as a hugely complex academic institution, it was difficult not to become overwhelmed by the sheer amount of information generated by all the different aspects that make up Online Instruction. What was clear by the end of the Ad Hoc Committee’s discussions was that there exists no single unified plan to strategize and plan how UCLA wants to implement Online Instruction. Many entities on campus, at least six, are currently exploring issues of Online Instruction, from their own unique viewpoint: technology, revenue generation, new degree programs, etc. Some units on campus are far ahead of others. Other units have not even begun to think of Online Instruction, for a variety of reasons, from no interest to lack of consistent financial or technical support from the dean/chair/director of the unit.

The challenge therefore was to construct a framework that allowed the Ad Hoc Committee to view all of these issues from the point of view of the Academic Senate. As such, the Ad Hoc Committee tried to address each question asked from that specific perspective, acknowledging some of these questions could have led to answers running to multiple pages touching on each interconnected issue at length.
FIRST SET OF QUESTIONS

1. Examine our current requirements (e.g., the “academic residency” requirement for the Masters degree) and see if they can be interpreted to fit our online needs.

   The Committee investigated the issue of academic residency at great length. A search of relevant documents from various University entities found varying definitions of academic residency for the Bachelor’s, Master’s and Doctoral degrees. The discussion centers on two different interpretations: “physical presence” versus “registered and enrolled.”

   It became clear to the Ad Hoc Committee early in its deliberations that a specific term and definition must be established for what we were discussing. “Distance Learning,” “eLearning,” “Online Instruction,” all of these terms are being used interchangeably yet each means something different, depending on the context in which it is used. The Ad Hoc Committee agreed to the term “Online Instruction” because in many ways it helped answer the question of academic residency by removing the issue of physical presence on campus.

   When it comes to Online Instruction, the question is not “Where is the student located?” when accessing an online course but rather “How will the student access the Instruction?” The use of the term Distance Learning has its roots in the concept of physical separation of students and instructors. Physical distance is not necessarily the case in an Online Instructional setting. A student may in fact be on the UCLA campus, in a dorm room or a library, taking a course online. Therefore the term “Online Instruction” more effectively captures the spirit of the modality of instruction.

   Of course the concern with the original ideas of Distance Learning was one of academic quality and control. After all, if the faculty and students where not on campus then how could the University maintain oversight of quality. Within the construct of Online Instruction, this is not the case. The faculty controls the content and the delivery modality through computer mediation. So whether the student is off-campus (one, two, or a thousand miles away) or on-campus (perhaps sitting next to the actual server room in the library) becomes irrelevant.

   With the above idea in mind, the Ad Hoc Committee searched through the UCLA Academic Senate Regulations, the University of California Academic Senate Regulations, the UCLA General Catalog, and the UCLA Graduate Division’s “Standards & Procedures for Graduate Study at UCLA” looking for definitions of academic residency. Perhaps not surprisingly, we found a variety of definitions: from the specific to the vague.

For The College, UCLA Senate Regulation 466 (A) states: “Only the following courses may be counted in satisfaction of the major: (1) courses in resident instruction at the University of California or at another college or university. (B) Resident instruction is defined as that which is offered to students in regular attendance during the quarter.”

The Bachelor’s Degree
The suggestion is physical presence, however the term “regular attendance” can also be easily applied to an online course. If a student logs onto the course, then clearly that student is in attendance.

For the School of Theater, Film and Television, UCLA Senate Regulation 441 (B) states: “A student is "in residence" only while enrolled and attending classes as a major in one of the departments of the School of Theater, Film and Television.”

Here too the Ad Hoc Committee finds this definition to work quite effectively in an Online Instructional environment. Enrollment is currently handled online, and once again when a student logs onto an online course, they are attending that course.

For the School of Arts and Architecture UCLA Senate Regulation 435 (F) states: “A student is "in residence" only while enrolled and attending classes as a major in one of the departments of the School of the Arts and Architecture.”

The same rationale applied to TFT applies to SOAA.

The UCLA Academic Senate Regulations governing the Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science has no definition of academic residency at all.

Other than the variations of language, which could be made uniform for clarity, from the standpoint of the UCLA Academic Senate, there is no need to draft new regulations regarding academic residency within an Online Instructional setting for the Bachelor’s Degree, when the definition of “attending” includes both physical and online attendance.

The Master’s and Doctoral Degrees

It is in the graduate programs the Ad Hoc Committee found some discrepancies concerning academic residency that should be addressed.

Residence for Master's Degrees UCLA Senate Regulation 512 states: “The minimum period of residence required for the Master's degree is one year (3 quarters) of academic residence, of which at least 2 quarters must be spent on the Los Angeles campus.”

In this regulation, the explicit statement of requiring 2 quarters “on the Los Angeles campus” strongly suggests the idea of physical presence. Members of the Ad Hoc Committee argued effectively that as long as the instruction is provided by UCLA faculty using content selected or created and approved by UCLA faculty, that the student was on campus “virtually.”

To assist in clarifying the interpretation of being “virtually present” on campus, the Ad Hoc Committee recommends rewording this regulation making a distinction between off-campus activity (a distant learning center, other university, field work…) and online instruction.
**Residence for the Ph.D. Degree UCLA Senate Regulation 522** states: “The minimum residence requirement for the Ph.D. degree is six quarters at the University of California, Los Angeles.”

This regulation is easily applied to an Online Instructional environment.

The Ad Hoc Committee found the most explicit and helpful definition of academic residency for both Master’s and Doctoral Degrees to come from the UCLA Graduate Division.

**From “Standards & Procedures for Graduate Study at UCLA” Master’s and Doctoral Degrees Academic Residence, Pages 7 & 9**

“The student is required to complete at least three quarters of academic residence (registration and enrollment) in graduate status at the University of California, including at least two quarters at UCLA. A student is in academic residence after completing at least one course (four units) in graduate or upper-division work during a quarter.”

Academic residence is clearly defined as being registered and enrolled at the University. This definition has been in use for many years due to the nature of graduate study in many disciplines. Students may find themselves doing field work for a quarter or more, so are not physically present on campus, but clearly must still be acknowledged as being in academic residence since they are pursuing their studies. This rationale fits easily with the construct on Online Instruction.

The Ad Hoc Committee strongly recommends that the definition of academic residency be uniformly adopted across campus as a student being registered and enrolled at the University. Physical presence should no longer be an issue when discussing Online Instruction.

**The University of California**

The UC Senate Regulation that governs academic residency is extremely vague in its language. Such vagueness may have been intentional, leaving the specific interpretation to each campus.

**University of California Senate Regulation 610** states: “Residence in any regular term is validated by a program of courses or other exercises approved by the Faculty of a student's college or school. For undergraduates this shall be at least six units of resident courses of instruction. Graduate students validate residence with programs of instruction or research approved by the appropriate Graduate Council.”

For undergraduate education, the term “resident courses of instruction” could be interpreted to mean physical presence on campus. This interpretation makes sense if an academic program has an off-campus learning center. The regulation would want to ensure undergraduates remained part of the campus community. However, as long as academic residence is defined as being registered and enrolled at the University, this
regulation clearly can allow for Online Instruction. If concern remains for off-campus instruction, this regulation should be rewritten to reflect this distinction.

One UCLA Academic Senate Regulation is in need of reconsideration when it comes to the Ad Hoc Committee’s recommendation for the definition of academic residency to be a student being registered and enrolled at the University.

Certificate of Resident Study for Foreign Students UCLA Senate Regulation 710
states: “Each college, school or graduate division of the University may issue a certificate of resident study to any foreign student under its jurisdiction provided that: (A) The student has completed at least nine courses with a grade average of at least 2.0 (2.5 in the Graduate Division). (B) The student has conducted satisfactorily a research program of at least nine calendar months. (C) The award of certificate is recommended by the department chairman in the student's major subject. (D) The student's studies are not covered by a diploma or other certificate. (E) The student's visa requires his or her return upon completion of studies in the United States.”

This regulation clearly implies physical presence on campus for a student to qualify for the certificate mentioned above. This regulation, to make it meaningful, must be rewritten to specifically state the need for a physical presence on campus. Without this clarification, by taking courses solely online a foreign student could seek this certificate that implies having studied abroad without having left his or her country.

2. If our current requirements and regulations (which often long predate recent technological advancements) are not suited to what we feel are our current academic needs and values, suggest what changes we need to consider.

This question has two separate and important parts to it: the first, administrative and fairly easy to deal with; the second, concerning values, is more philosophical in nature, more complex, and therefore should be addressed first.

Considerations of Academic Philosophy

From faculty who were early adopters of technology in the classroom to great hostility from faculty who see technology as dehumanizing education, it became clear to the Ad Hoc Committee that a broad spectrum of views and opinions of Online Instruction exists among UCLA faculty. Such reactions are to be expected at a time of fundamental changes to the nature of education, on many levels.

The Ad Hoc Committee spent much time discussing what should be the appropriate levels of implementation of Online Instruction at each degree level. The conclusions became self-evident once we agreed on what the basic educational experience should be for the Bachelor’s, Master’s and Doctoral degrees. It is important to distinguish between Online Instruction in the form of online courses, and Online Instruction in the form of online degree programs.

It was the conclusion of the Ad Hoc Committee that although some online courses could make sense in some doctoral programs, fully online Ph.D. programs are not
desirable at this time. The very nature of doctoral education relies on physical presence for personal interaction with a mentor. However the Ad Hoc Committee recognizes advances in “virtual presence” technology may allow for adequate contact between student and mentor in the future. Such decisions will be dependant heavily on a discipline’s comfort and/or reliance on technology.

It was also the conclusion of the Ad Hoc Committee that a fully online Bachelor’s Degree from UCLA would not be desirable at this time. The intellectual, emotional, and social development that takes place among undergraduates cannot currently be mediated through online technology. An undergraduate education is about much more than going to classes.

However, the Ad Hoc Committee unanimously agreed that Online Instruction in various forms could tremendously enhance undergraduate education at UCLA. Such instruction has been taking place at UCLA for the last few years. Application of such Online Instruction has been piecemeal, depending on faculty interest and institutional support. The UCLA College has been a strong leader in the creation of online courses. Teaching and learning increasingly depends on the use of online tools for communication, presentation of and access to information in a variety of media formats, discussions, quizzes, assignments and many activities that support engagement with course concepts. As a result, between the extremes of all face-to-face delivery and all online delivery of instruction, there is a continuum of modalities, based on mixes of various teaching approaches and technology.

The two most common terms used to differentiate this mixed-mode modality are “web-enhanced” instruction which is characterized by the addition of online information and activities to a traditional course and “blended” instruction, in which a significant part of the course activities are conducted online (for example, by delivering online lectures), replacing activities previously conducted face-to-face.

As stated previously, web-enhanced courses have been offered at UCLA for a number of years quite effectively with a yearly increase of courses adopting such a teaching modality. The Ad Hoc Committee encourages the development of blended courses as well in disciplines that can take advantage of developing technology.

In the final analysis, the Ad Hoc Committee recognizes Online Instruction as an additional set of education tools that will be adopted by some degree programs in some fields readily because it will make the job of teaching and learning more effective and efficient. Other degree programs in other fields will not begin to use these new tools until they are recognized as aiding, rather than harming, the education mission of the University.

As to Master’s Degree Programs, the Ad Hoc Committee sees this area as the most fertile ground for exploring Online Instruction in both forms of online courses and fully online degree programs. The nature of certain Master’s Degree Programs lend themselves quite effectively to Online Instruction. The School of Nursing and The Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science have each proposed fully online Master’s Degree programs. The issues of self-supporting programs versus state funded programs will be addressed later in this report.
Administrative Considerations

The first issue raised by Question #2 is the administrative need for a new Academic Senate Regulation specifically governing Online Instruction for fully online Master’s Degree Programs as no such regulation currently exists and an existing regulation is being misapplied.

The University of California Academic Senate Regulation 694 (Appendix B) was written to exercise quality control and regulation of Master’s Degree Programs using off-campus learning sites. It is a rather complex and poorly written regulation. Unfortunately, in the absence of any other appropriate Academic Senate Regulation, UC SR 694 is being used to evaluate fully online, self-supporting Master’s Degree Programs.

The Ad Hoc Committee is unanimous in its belief that UC SR 694 was not written for, and should not be applied to, Online Instruction. (Please see Appendix C for the Ad Hoc Committee’s analysis of UC SR 694.) The Committee spent time discussing the drafting of a new regulation, SR 695 that would address specifically the issues associated with Online Instruction in the form of a fully online Master’s Degree Program.

In parallel with the Ad Hoc Committee’s deliberations, the UC Academic Senate committee, The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) began discussions along similar lines at the request of Chair McDonald, who was a member of CCGA at the time. The result of these deliberations has been the drafting of UC SR 695, which is designed to specifically address issues such as academic residency within the construct of a fully online Master’s Degree Program. This new Senate Regulation reflects the thinking of both this Ad Hoc Committee and CCGA as to how Online Instruction should be regulated within the UC.

As of the writing of this report, UC SR 695 was in its final drafting stages and being readied for distribution to the UC system for comment.

3. Do we need any new requirements to assure the quality and integrity of online teaching and learning? Do we need special methods of evaluation, for example?

This question is one that presented the Ad Hoc Committee with the fundamental challenge of exploring issues of Online Instruction: What is the fundamental difference between physical presence learning and Online Instruction? The simple answer is the reliance on technology to be the sole delivery agent of course content. As such, an over emphasis on the quality and integrity of the technology to be used in delivery of Online Instruction begins to dominate any discussion on this topic. Such discussions of technology should be left to others. Academic Senate involvement in such discussions is important. However, from the Academic Senate point of view, a discussion of technology should be secondary. The primary point of discussion should be ensuring the quality of the content and teaching of the course and evidence of student learning.

Ensuring the quality and integrity of online teaching and learning should be no different than ensuring the quality and integrity of the teaching and learning that takes place in a physical classroom. UCLA has different types of mechanisms to evaluate these issues already in place: departmental faculty approval, Graduate/Undergraduate Council approval, etc.
It is the technological component that causes people to believe a different set of evaluative methods should be applied to Online Instruction. Discussion then devolves to computer platforms, teaching software, connection speeds, and the like.

But let’s place ourselves back in the physical classroom and explore how we as a faculty evaluate the quality and integrity of teaching and learning. We do not check the PowerPoint slides for clarity prior to presentation. We do not approve the type of laptop to be used by the professor (or students for that matter). We do not check what type of VCR or DVD player is being used in the classroom. We do not pre-approve the content of the lecture to be presented by an instructor.

In this physical learning environment, we learn about the effectiveness of teaching and learning by both formal and informal methods. Formally, students fill out course evaluations on which they will comment on the quality of the form, content and structure of the course. We can expect the same type of evaluations from Online Instructional environments as well. Online students will be given course evaluation forms and they will readily point out all strengths and deficiencies of the course (and the instructor), whether in content, form or structure.

No new methods of evaluation of online courses would be required.

SECOND SET OF QUESTIONS

1. Can all courses for a degree be online? Do different degree levels make a difference? (For example, would we want to allow only some percentage of undergraduate courses to be online while we might allow an entire Masters degree to be offered online?)

As has been true throughout this report, the answers to these two questions vary. Ultimately, each department, program, division or school will determine what percentage of online courses may be desirable for a particular degree program.

The burden of review of such proposals shall fall upon the two Academic Senate committees charged with review, evaluation and approval of curricular matters: Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council. These two councils shall continue to weigh the merits of any curricular proposal that comes before them, no matter the means of delivery. Certainly a topic of debate and discussion, particularly in the early stages of implementing online delivery, will be the successful ratio of online to in person instruction. As new delivery methods become more common, the discussion will become as routine as the current discussion for any degree program as to the ratio of lecture courses to seminars.

2. Do we want to identify courses as “online” in the course title or description so that students know what they are electing?

The Ad Hoc Committee recommends that indications of course modality be added to course descriptions. The absence of any modality indicator will indicate a course that meets physically on campus for the hours and schedule listed.

“B” Blended Course: A course delivered using a mix of both online and in-classroom work. Blended instruction requires access to online information, resources, and
activities, in combination with some scheduled in-class meetings. Exams will be taken in an assigned physical location.

**“O” Online Course**: A course delivered completely online with the exception of exams, which will be taken in an assigned physical location.

3. **Many lecture courses currently have some online content. What level of online content would require the “online” designation?**

   The delivery of material completely online (100%) would require an “online” designation, that is, no face-to-face activities, with the exception of the final exam. Both online content and content in other formats (for example, films or books) may be required in an online course.

   In the view of the Ad Hoc Committee, the “Blended” course may become as common as today’s “physical presence” instructional modality. With supporting material for courses being commonly posted online at present, the online delivery of some lecture material is currently going through its development phase throughout the country.

   The ideal blending of modalities will depend heavily on the academic discipline, but the “Blended” form may become so common that it will be the assumed method of instruction and courses solely requiring physical presence or online presence may need distinct designation.

4. **Will some face-to-face meetings between instructors and students be required?**

   As stated above, the Ad Hoc Committee considers this question a programmatic issue that falls within existing curricular and program senate and departmental governing bodies. As experience with Online Instruction grows at UCLA, instructors and departments can be expected to experiment with “blended” courses that meet the instructional requirements of the discipline, level, size, and type of course in which the percentage of time of face-to-face instruction varies over time.

   Once again, “virtual presence” technology may allow for a type of “face-to-face” meeting that will be perfectly acceptable to both instructor and student. Each discipline will make this determination.

5. **How will cheating be monitored in online courses?**

   Many of the methods currently used for face-to-face instruction are similarly effective (and ineffective) in Online Instruction. One of the benefits of Online Instruction resides in the increased potential for instructor-student interactions. Such interactions (email, chat rooms, forums, blogs…) contribute to a deeper knowledge of a student’s capabilities and work than is often possible in face-to-face courses in which opportunities for personal interaction can be highly restricted.

   Proctored exams (although the physical location could be off-campus) will likely continue to be required to satisfy exam requirements.
6. **If online courses are offered in a high-fee program, should they also be available to regularly enrolled students—or vice-versa?**

Each program will need to determine the impact of the practice of mixing student groups. Financial as well as administrative issues will need to be weighed. The larger philosophical discussion concerning mixing students from “for profit” programs with students from state-sponsored programs will need to occur at the level of the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council. State regulations as well as admissions policies may be issues to consider.

7. **Are policies in place to protect adequately faculty intellectual property?**

The Ad Hoc Committee believes sufficient safeguards exist at UCLA to protect the intellectual property of faculty in all of its varied forms, regardless of delivery method.

Questions on this subject should always be raised though as what is clear is that the introduction of new delivery methods seems to muddy the waters of intellectual property in the minds of some administrators. Faculty must remain diligent on this front.

8. **How much of a faculty member’s workload should consist of online courses?**

The response to this question is quite complex because it depends on the full spectrum of technology and teaching support services provided to the faculty member in preparing for and delivering a course. Additional types of staff, both technical, pedagogical, and instructional, will need to team with the faculty member, with an increased need for teaching assistants and undergraduate assistants for large courses because Online Instruction requires a high level of interaction with students.

The Ad Hoc Committee believes that the issue of workload must be discussed and decided at the local level, as it is presently. Just as each academic unit evaluates the workload implications of a large lecture course or a smaller seminar, so too will each unit need to weigh the unique demands of Online Instruction upon a faculty member’s workload.

9. **Is adequate computing infrastructure in place to support the anticipated popularity of online course offerings?**

Because UCLA’s computing infrastructure is provided by dozens of academic units and divisions, there is no single answer to this question. The simple answer is that the capacity and support for technology must increase as the dependency on technology increases – be this server space, access to digital materials, software and data, network and system reliability, etc. Indeed the diversity of services and where they would need to go to find support will be a challenge to students taking courses in multiple departments and divisions. Support services will be as critical to students as the computing infrastructure and these are currently almost non-existent for undergraduate students.
Having heard from both University Extension and the Office of Instructional Development, the Ad Hoc Committee strongly encourages the engagement of both these units in constructing the technological and support infrastructures needed for Online Instruction. Both UNEX and OID have extensive experience in this area. A much more unified approach to the technological and support infrastructure is not only more efficient, but more economical. Online delivery is too costly to continue the practice of expecting each unit to reinvent the wheel by building their own infrastructures. Just as we do not expect each unit to build their own lecture halls and seminar rooms, we should not expect them to build an equally complex and expensive technological and support infrastructure. Allowances must be made for the unique needs of each program, and perhaps those costs should be bourn by the individual unit.

10. How can we ensure that some students (especially undergrads) do not have an advantage based on superior technology available to them on an individual basis?

In regards to undergraduates taking either web-enhanced or blended courses, using the definition of Online Instruction established at the beginning of this report, most students have access to state-of-the-art computer technology on the UCLA campus. UCLA needs to be vigilant in reviewing the adequacy of student technology services as the dependency on technology increases in course delivery. In addition, UCLA must give students clear advice on the technical requirements and knowledge needed to take an online or blended course, and offer training in taking courses online and by providing 24/7 support services.
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Appendix A – Charge Letter from Academic Senate Chair

December 17, 2004

Chair William McDonald, GC Chair (Theater, Film & Television)
James D. Denardo, Continuing & Community Education Chair (Political Science)
Jan De Leeuw, UgC (Statistics)
Lowell Gallagher, UgC (English)
Mark Hansen, GC (Statistics)
Donna McNeese-Smith, School of Nursing FEC (Nursing)
Harold G. Monbouquette, Engineering & Applied Science FEC (Chemical Engineering)
David L. Rigby, UgC Chair (Geography)
Ruth Sabean, Assistant Vice-Provost/Director of Educational Technology

Dear Colleagues,

I am appointing you all to serve as an ad hoc committee of the senate to look at the issue of online and distance learning at UCLA. This may sound familiar to some of you, since the senate has approached the issue piecemeal before. We would like the current committee to think through the issues connected with online education and make recommendations on this topic. Since we are facing increasing numbers of both online courses and degree proposals that are partially or wholly online, we should, as a faculty, try to set the guidelines and values we need so that each new proposal does not have to tackle this issue anew.

With this in mind, we would like the committee to do two sets of tasks. While these tasks will necessarily overlap, we are hoping that the more urgent questions that directly effect new degree program proposals can be answered first—and relatively quickly.

First set of tasks (to be completed by the end of Winter 2005 if possible):

1. Examine our current requirements (e.g., the “academic residency” requirement for the Masters degree) and see if they can be interpreted to fit our online needs.

2. If our current requirements and regulations (which often long predate recent technological advancements) are not suited to what we feel are our current academic needs and values, suggest what changes we need to consider. These suggestions will go back to the Graduate and Undergraduate Council as well as any other relevant senate committees for discussion and implementation (and then forwarding to the Legislative Assembly if that is required).
3. Do we need any new requirements to assure the quality and integrity of online teaching and learning? Do we need special methods of evaluation, for example?

Second set of tasks (to be completed by Spring 2005 if possible):
Consider online courses and curricula in a broader light to answer some of the following questions:
1. Can all courses for a degree be online? Do different degree levels make a difference? (For example, would we want to allow only some percentage of undergraduate courses to be online while we might allow an entire Masters degree to be offered online?)
2. Do we want to identify courses as “online” in the course title or description so that students know what they are electing?
3. Many lecture courses currently have some online content. What level of online content would require the “online” designation?
4. Will some face-to-face meetings between instructors and students be required?
5. How will cheating be monitored in online courses?
6. If online courses are offered in a high-fee program, should they also be available to regularly enrolled students—or vice-versa?
7. Are policies in place to protect adequately faculty intellectual property?
8. How much of a faculty member’s workload should consist of online courses?
9. Is adequate computing infrastructure in place to support the anticipated popularity of online course offerings?
10. How can we ensure that some students (especially undergrads) do not have an advantage based on superior technology available to them on an individual basis?

Please feel free to invite to the committee experts from administrative or faculty areas to answer technical or other questions when needed. After the committee has reported its recommendations on these issues, we can decide if we need a new committee (or to continue this committee for those who are willing) to take up any further topics regarding online and distance learning.

Thanks you for your willingness to serve on the committee. I believe its work will be central to curricular decisions we make over the next few years.

Sincerely,

Kathleen L. Komar,
Chair of the Academic Senate

Cc: Chancellor Albert Carnesale, Vice-Chancellor Daniel Neuman, Luisa Crespo, Linda Mohr
Appendix B – University of California Senate Regulation 694

694. A school, department, or group of departments which offers a program leading to a Master's degree under the jurisdiction of a Graduate Division, may, in cooperation with University Extension, provide at a center or centers other than a campus of the University, a program of graduate instruction designed to satisfy, in full or in part, the requirements for that degree. Such off-campus graduate instruction shall be authorized, on the recommendation of the school, department, or group of departments concerned, only if, in the judgment of the Graduate Council concerned, the proposed program will afford distinct advantages to society and will not be detrimental to the standards ordinarily required for the degree. Programs of off-campus graduate instruction and study are subject to the following provisions:

A. Requirements for a professional Master's degree may be satisfied in full by off-campus graduate study unless the Graduate Council concerned determines that a substantial part of those requirements may be more effectively satisfied by resident study on a campus of the University.

B. No more than one-half of the total unit and residence requirements for the degree of Master of Arts or Master of Science may be satisfied by off-campus graduate study.

C. Each proposed program of off-campus graduate instruction must be approved by the Graduate Council of the Division concerned, and such approval shall be granted only if the Council shall have determined that the proposed course offerings, facilities, and staff are at least equivalent to those available on the campus of the University where the program leading to the degree is ordinarily offered.

D. Each course to be included in an off-campus graduate program, and each instructor in such a course who is not a member of the department of the University in which the corresponding course is offered, must be approved by the Graduate Council of the Division concerned, and in accordance with the usual University procedures and with such special procedures as the Council may determine. The Council shall make an annual review of all programs of off-campus graduate instruction with respect to course offerings, facilities, and staff.

E. No student may enroll in an off-campus graduate program who has not been admitted to a Graduate Division.
Appendix C – Ad Hoc Committee Analysis of UC SR 694

Comments/Questions on Academic Senate Regulation 694 in relation to Online Instruction

ACADEMIC SENATE REGULATION 694.
A school, department, or group of departments which offer a program leading to a Master’s degree under the jurisdiction of a Graduate Division, may, in cooperation with University Extension,1 provide at a center or centers2 other than a campus of the University, a program of graduate instruction designed to satisfy, in full or in part, the requirements for that degree.3 Such off-campus graduate instruction shall be authorized, on the recommendation of the school, department or group of departments concerned, only if, in the judgment of the Graduate Council concerned, the proposed program will afford distinct advantages to society4 and will not be detrimental to the standards ordinarily required for the degree.5 Programs of off-campus graduate instruction and study are subject to the following provisions:

A. Requirements for a professional Master’s degree may be satisfied in full by off-campus graduate study unless the Graduate Council concerned determines that a substantial part of those requirements may be more effectively satisfied by resident study on a campus of the university.6

1 Does such a program of “off-campus” instruction have to be run in cooperation with University Extension?

2 What is the relationship between online instruction and instruction at centers that are “off-campus”?
Is online instruction produced at a single division of the university, or at several divisions of the university, considered “off-campus” instruction?

3 This sentence suggests that graduate programs can only offer online degrees that they currently offer at a campus of the university. This seems to suggest that a program that does not offer a professional Master’s degree on a campus, cannot offer a professional Master’s degree online.

4 What are distinct advantages to society?

5 If online instruction became so successful that a program wanted to stop teaching “on-campus” and devote all energies to online instruction, would that be considered detrimental? There are additional concerns that faculty may be pressured to develop online classes at the same time as they are fulfilling other responsibilities; the end result may be a dilution of their research and general teaching efforts.
Do the standards ordinarily required for the degree pertain to course content, to faculty contact, etc – the statement is unclear.

6 This point does not answer the question posed in note 3.
B. No more than one-half of the total unit and residence requirements for the
degree of Master of Arts or Master of Science may be satisfied by off-
campus graduate study.  

C. Each proposed program of off-campus graduate instruction must be
approved by the Graduate Council of the Division concerned, and such
approval shall be granted only if the Council shall have determined that
the proposed course offerings, facilities, and staff are at least equivalent to
those available on the campus of the University where the program
leading to the degree is ordinarily offered.  

D. Each course to be included in an off-campus graduate program, and each
instructor in such a course who is not a member of the department of the
University in which the corresponding course is offered, must be approved
by the Graduate Council of the Division concerned, and in accordance
with the usual University procedures and with such special procedures as
the Council may determine. The Council shall make an annual review of
all programs of off-campus graduate instruction with respect to course
offerings, facilities, and staff.  

E. No student may enroll in an off-campus graduate program who has not
been admitted to a Graduate Division.

The most important question raised by current Academic Senate Regulation 694
is whether online instruction is to be equated with off-campus or on-campus
programs of study. If online is equated with on-campus, then 694 has little to say
in terms of online education. However, if online is equated with off-campus, then
694 poses some challenges for online instruction. The two most pressing issues
then become whether online degree programs can only be offered when that same
degree program already exists on campus, and the unit and residency
requirements for MA/MSc degrees.

---

7 If “off-campus” is interpreted as online, then B poses significant problems for online instruction.
However, if online is equated with “on-campus”, B is moot.

8 If a student is registered and enrolled on campus, s/he satisfies residency requirements, but may
be taking classes off campus. What exactly is the intent of the residency requirement?

9 Point C suggests that online programs must mirror programs of study that are already taught on
campus. This might be read, once more, as indicating that “off-campus” programs of graduate
education can only be offered if they already exist in an on-campus form.

10 If online is equated with “off-campus”, how much review do we want to engage in – every
class, every year. This seems overly burdensome.
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Instructional Terminology: Modalities and Formats
Spring 2005

Introduction

Teaching and learning increasingly depends on the use of online tools for communication, presentation of and access to information in a variety of media formats, discussions, quizzes, assignments and many activities that support engagement with course concepts. As a result, between the extremes of all face-to-face delivery and all online delivery of instruction, there is a continuum of modalities, based on mixes of various teaching approaches and technology.

The two most common terms used to differentiate this mixed-mode modality are

1) “web-enhanced” instruction which is characterized by the addition of online information and activities to a traditional course and
2) “hybrid” or “blended” instruction, in which a significant part of the course activities are conducted online (for example, by delivering online lectures), replacing activities previously conducted face-to-face.

Currently in UCLA degree programs, the extremes of the continuum are scarce, whereas examples of type 1 are prevalent and of type 2 are increasing. This change in instructional modality is consistent with the Units and Hours of Work section of the “Guide to Undergraduate Course and Program Approval” which states that “…the Los Angeles Division has adopted a policy of breaking the lockstep between course credit and hours spent in class, and of encouraging experimentation and innovation in format and instructional methods.”

Recommendations

Given the resulting fluidity in the integration of online work with face-to-face work, the Subcommittee recommends that:

1) instructional terminology used in Senate policy statements remain primarily unchanged because it adequately describes instructional formats;
2) text be added to clarify the multiple methods by which any particular instructional format may now be delivered using different modalities; examples are lecture, discussion, lab, and recitation.
3) direct references to the location of instruction, such as “classroom” or “meeting”, be removed from instructional format descriptions in Section VII. A, Table 5 and be replaced with place-neutral language. For example, a seminar is currently described as “Students meet with an instructor in a
small classroom setting…” which could be restated as “Students learn in small groups with the instructor…”

Finally, the Subcommittee recommends that indications of course modality be added to course descriptions. The absence of any modality indicator will indicate a course that meets physically on campus for the hours and schedule listed.

“B” Blended Course: A course delivered using a mix of both online and in-classroom work. Blended instruction requires access to online information, resources, and activities, in combination with some scheduled in-class meetings. Exams will be taken in an assigned physical location.

“O” Online Course: A course delivered totally online with the exception of exams which will be taken in an assigned physical location.

**Lexicon**

**Off-campus:** Student meets residence requirements and is physically present at least x% of the quarter at a center or centers other than a campus of the university.

**On-campus:** Student meets residence requirements and is physically present for at least x% of the quarter at a campus of the university.

**Class type:** Retain the current terminology with the clarification that physical presence may be required for none, some or all of the scheduled hours of instruction.

**Contact Hours:** The number of hours a faculty member is directly available in near-synchronous time to students via face-to-face and electronic communication.

**Course Credit:** The definition remains unchanged. It is based on the number of hours of work required to fulfill the course requirements regardless of location of where the work is accomplished.
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Online Workgroup
January 31, 2005
1:00-3:00 p.m.

PRESENT: J. De Nardo; B. McDonald; R. Sabean; J. de Leeuw; D. Rigby; L. Gallagher; H. Monbouquette; M. Hansen; D. McNeese-Smith.

STAFF: L. Crespo; L. Mohr.

Guests identified to contribute to the discussion:

Jim Davis, Associate Vice Chancellor, Information & Technology
Robert Lapiner, Dean, University Extension and Continuing Education
Larry Loeker, Director, Office of Instructional Development

Academic Mission of the University:

• Where does online instruction fit within the academic standards and mission for a research university?
• How to deliver online material with the construct of the Senate and Master Plan.
• What is the motivation for providing online instruction?
  o Financial considerations for self-supporting degree programs offered online.
  o Expanding access to overenrolled courses particularly at the undergraduate level.
  o Explore new methods of instruction through new innovative technology that might improve the educational experience of the student.
• What is the role of UNEX, and the delivery of this instruction? UNEX is precluded from offering degree programs.

Online courses:

• Intellectual ownership of courses
  o Who owns the product of the online instructional program? Individual faculty? University? See Campus Counsel document for legal clarification and royalty distribution.
• Bachelor’s degrees may provide online instruction, but degree programs are not a viable option at this time. Do not discuss degree programs, but the standards for undergraduate courses.
• Will the courses be open only to UCLA students or to anyone?
• If teaching online courses will this exempt faculty from teaching an in-class course? Nursing model requires that faculty double the workload to teach the course online and on campus.
• Set up costs for faculty and course materials?
• Will there be significant curricular revisions required to offer the course materials online as opposed to classroom instruction?
• What are the procedures for reviewing and approving courses online?

Part-time Professional Graduate Degree Programs:

• There are two proposals for online Masters degree program: MSN in Nursing Administration in the School of Nursing and a new schoolwide M. of Eng. in HSSEAS.
• The two programs are being proposed as self-supporting initiatives that are required to adhere to the same standards and criteria for graduate degree programs and require the approval of the Graduate Council.
• Academic Senate Regulation 694 allows for expanding flexible part-time graduate professional degrees specifically for working professionals.
• Self-supporting programs will not be funded by State General Funds.
• There are industry incentives to support graduate education for their employees. USC and Stanford are the models for these types of programs.
• The workload for the faculty will be doubled with the number of graduate students that must be supervised. No compensation has been included as part of these proposals.
• AGSM faculty and models for compensation of faculty should be examined in the next review.
• Will the self-supporting online degree programs have an impact on the state-funded graduate and undergraduate instructional programs?
Online Workgroup  
February 7, 2005  
1:00-3:00 p.m.

PRESENT:  J. De Nardo; B. McDonald; R. Sabeau; D. Rigby; L. Gallagher; H. Monbouquette;  
M. Hansen; D. McNeese-Smith.

GUEST:  J. Davis.

ABSENT:  J. de Leeuw (on site visit).

STAFF:  L. Crespo; L. Mohr.

The Internet Supported Learning Study was distributed to the committee. The document is located at [http://www.a-hec.org/e-learning_study.html](http://www.a-hec.org/e-learning_study.html).

Mr. Davis, Associate Vice Chancellor-Information Technology, discussed his previous experience with online instruction at Ohio State University.

Motivation for online instruction differs from that at UCLA:
- Ohio was losing its professional sector to more metropolitan areas due to the lack of postgraduate opportunities. The state government responded by developing initiatives that would provide post-graduate instructional programs for this group.
- Ohio’s Board of Trustees supported the online instruction, but balanced this objective with the research mission of the University.
- UCLA is exploring this option due to budgetary considerations.
- UCLA emphasis is more focused on research than at Ohio State.

Tuition issues were the primary focus of the online discussion at Ohio State:
- Should there be on campus versus off-campus online instruction.
- How would instate, out-of-state, and international fees apply?
- What cost structures are appropriate to also make the online option attractive to out-of-state students?

Costs analysis:
- On campus, resident base fee with all other fees above the base going to return rate. Return rate goes back to department.
- Costs prohibitive on a course-by-course basis; would have to do on a program level.
- Some courses would be simple to transfer based on a lecture structure, but others would require major technology (average = 100 hours per one hour of online material).
- Campuswide infrastructure required to administer admissions, payments, access to library and other resources.

Certificates versus degrees:
- Certificates can drive costs on markets.
- Degree programs are more problematic.
- Would need to

Quality of programs:
- Big part of discussion was the interactive vs. passive methods of instruction.
- Recent studies indicate that retention rates for online instruction were low.
- Many students preferred some face time with instructor, and interaction with other students on projects.
- Practical issues were exams, practicum that would require at least one time campus visit.
• Homework verification.
• Hybrid instruction seems to be more effective, and online instructional programs are reconsidering this mode (see CUNY).

Degree programs vs. courses:
• The primary focus was the Masters for Professional Schools such as Nursing, Dentistry, Engineering at Ohio State, and was more effectively applied.
• This required dean’s support needed to expend more resources for set-up, and to establish return on the investment.
• Some undergraduate degree courses with large enrollments or with a remedial focus might be considered.

Infrastructure for delivery of instructional programs:
• University Extension has the expertise, but has limited authority to deliver instruction for the campus. This would require a change in governance.
• The problem with UNEX would be the separation of costs, and return rates.
• There would be a financial burden to provide training for faculty on preparing coursework for online programming.
• Ohio State established training unit for dentistry to keep faculty up to date.
• Faculty would be required to get training and to develop models for course development.
• What resources, exist, what would need to be refocused, program/school initiatives?
• Office of Instructional Development could provide course development and faculty training.
• Ms. Sabean’s committee is preparing a report on issues of leadership, service integration, governance, and funding. The report would be completed in Spring.

Other issues:
• The schools are motivated by using these programs as profit centers to free up state resources.
• The programs would need to have an accurate assessment of the market and the potential to make a profit, and not just cover costs.
• Nursing is clearly a program to address the market demand.
• Other issues might include providing educational services for post-baccalaureate programs.
• UCLA providing continue educational opportunities to surrounding communities.
• The UNEX committee is gathering data on online issues such as certificates, enrollments, and resources invested.
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The following documents were redistributed to the Committee:

- Senate Regulation 694
- UCOP policy on Self Supporting Programs
- Standards and Procedures for Graduate Study

The Standards govern all graduate programs, and include the Graduate Council and Graduate Division requirements for admission, and degree requirements.

The academic residency requirement is different at each UC campus. UCLA only requires that a student registers and enrolls at UCLA, but graduate students may complete field studies off campus.

Foreign students and language testing for international students would need to be clarified. The students would need to meet the basic admissions requirements including language.

The UCOP policy on self-supporting raises several issues that must be clarified including the following items:

II.E.: Self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs may be administered in cooperation with University Extension where and when appropriate.

UNEX may be used as a medium to deliver courses that are administered through the administrative and departmental offices of the University. The CCGA interpretation is that this is an option, and not requirement. The discussion should include how to bring UNEX together with the regular campus faculty and students.

IV.B: Students must be admitted to a Graduate Division through the regular admissions process in order to enroll in any program established under this policy.

The admissions process would be similar to that of the FEMBA and EMBA programs with the Graduate Division determining final admissions for students.

VI.A. Proposals may be considered for self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs that do not correspond to regular programs that a campus is authorized to offer.

Senate Regulation 694:
A. Requirements for a professional Master's degree may be satisfied in full by off-campus graduate study unless the Graduate Council concerned determines that a substantial part of those requirements may be more effectively satisfied by resident study on a campus of the University.

B. No more than one-half of the total unit and residence requirements for the degree of Master of Arts or Master of Science may be satisfied by off-campus graduate study.

The workgroup considered revising 694B to clarify the issues related to online instructional programs as opposed to the assumptions made for “off-campus” instructional programs. The online program would require the use of regular UCLA faculty to instruct courses, and this would not represent off-campus instruction as originally intended in SR694.

A proposed modification to AS694 would clarify the difference between professional and academic master’s degrees. Also, the language would need to consider the curricular purview and oversight for the programs, and how to validate quality of instruction. The assumption will be that the faculty and curriculum would be completely within the authority of the University.

Another option is to create a new regulation for online instruction to more specifically refer to distance learning technology, and the use of these methods in the delivery of curriculum. The discussion would eliminate the language related to on campus and off-campus instruction.

David Rigby agreed to interpret AS694 for the workgroup. A new regulation will be considered separately so that the pending proposals can be processed without depending on the lengthy process of modifying Senate wide Regulations.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.
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It was reported that the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) is
proposing an amendment to SR694 to clarify the language regarding distance learning,
and online educational programs.

The following issues were discussed:

• UNEX cooperation to be clarified as an option
• Online instruction defined as “on or off campus instruction”
• Only offer online degree that is currently taught on campus
• Online vs. off-campus regarding academic residency
• Definitions of programs that are taught by UCLA faculty.
• Instructional delivery needs to be clarified.
• Refine curriculum to allow for other instructional titles.
• Criteria for evaluating quality of instruction.

Mr. Rigby agreed to revise 694.
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- The committee will ask Larry Loeher to attend an upcoming meeting of the committee to discuss criteria for evaluation, and to recent WASC accreditation process.
- Dean Lapiner will also be invited as a guest at an upcoming meeting of the committee.
- The MS in Engineering was approved by the Graduate Council and sent to CCGA for the system-wide review. The review was deferred to Fall 2005.
- A subcommittee at CCGA has been created to consider Online instruction, distance learning, system-wide oversight of these programs, and current regulations.
- UCSC has formulated 8 questions to consider in the process of approval of online courses.
- Structures to proceed with this discussion.
- Separate out procedures and policies for online courses and degree programs.
- Masters and undergraduate degree programs have been discussed, but doctoral degrees have not been considered.
- Who are the competitors and what the disciplines?
- The Master Plan definition and designation or degree offerings by the different systems.
- Margie Greenwald UCOP PowerPoint presentation will be distributed.
- CSU-UC are offering joint doctoral programs.
- CSU will offer applied doctorates.
- Professional vs. academic: requirements for admissions have to be the same.
- All students admitted through Graduate Division.
- Online courses allow for students to change between degree programs but there must be a request for switching programs.
- Issues regarding the revenue stream were discussed. The possibility of creating “have and have nots” on campus was considered.
- Taxation and the use of fees to go back to the general campus.
- The legislature may consider online instructional programs as a mechanism to deliver UC programs to CA residents in remote locations. The issue would address the topic of the academic mission of the UC system, and the possibility of assigning state resources to support this option.
- The legislature may look at the revenues and decide to open admissions into these programs to everyone.
- Will faculty be required to teach or do research on site or would the technology allow them to be in residence if they are continuing to participate in the teaching and research programs of their departments? Would need to consult with Faculty Welfare and CAP.
- Undergraduate online degrees may be a demand of the constituents of the legislature.
- Residence for Master’s Degrees. The minimum period of residence required for the Master’s Degree is one year (3 quarters) of academic residence, of which at least 2 quarters must be spent on the Los Angeles campus.
- May 17 meeting to consider UCSC questions.
- May 24 meeting with Larry Loeher.
- The UCSC questions were divided into categories of:
Degree programs: 1, 6
Courses: 2-5, 8
Both: 9-10

• Faculty teaching experience for hiring and training for online instruction was mentioned.
• Different motivations for teaching online programs (financial gain, more effective delivery of instruction, etc.)
• Lists of questions for online course approval.
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Discussion of Instructional Formats as listed on the Course Inventory Management System (CIMS):

The discussion included the proposal to offer undergraduate instructional programs through online instruction or a hybrid form of instruction. The committee believes that this teaching modality is eventual as many comparable programs are offering this type of instructional program for both financial and academic reasons. The Committee has focused its previous discussion on graduate programs, but will discuss primarily undergraduate instructional programs.

It was agreed that the university will need to consider the academic rationale for these courses, and the current policies and procedures as well as infrastructure to review and approve these courses and programs.

The committee discussed the percentage of a course taught on line and the training of the instructor in teaching courses online. The Councils would want to define the courses as either hybrid or online, and determine the number of units that are applicable to the degree. Hybrid would indicate that there is some onsite contact with faculty and/or other students. The assumption would be a hybrid model for all undergraduate courses.

The course instructional mode would need to be defined as hybrid on the CIMS course form, and the instructor evaluated for teaching in this mode. The field studies program criteria might serve as a model for instructional training, and evaluation of quality. The councils could establish the policy to determine if an instructor is qualified to teach online. The procedures would need to be included in the CIMS course form.

The course delivery format might include new terms: onsite, online, and hybrid. The form could require a syllabus template to evaluate content and quality. The form could add categories for unscheduled contact, e-mail, chat room, office hours to consider faculty student and student-student interactions.

It was noted that hybrid courses will allow tenured track faculty to teach smaller courses, and that this redistribution of workload should be articulated in the proposal. The committee will need to continue its consideration of the lexicon to clearly identify the type of course, and the method of instruction, the relevant regulations that must be considered, and the policies and procedures requiring revision or clarification. Another issue is the operational tasks such as course approval forms, catalog copy, and the administrative reporting of faculty workload.

The committee agreed that the delegation of authority to the FEC's should be rescinded for undergraduate courses using online instruction. This will allow the UgC to monitor the standards for review and approval of these courses for a limited period of time to then prepare criteria for evaluation.
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Distance Learning

- WASC guidelines have proposed new definitions for distance learning
- Synchronist and Asynchronist
- Actual degree programs will require student services such as advising, mentoring, exams and instructor guides.
- Each campus will need to set standards for quality and assess themselves. WASC generally applies the same quality control as onsite programs. This might require additional workload for the faculty.

Larry Loeher, Office of Instructional Development

Videoconferencing

- Certificate programs assess quality if there is a decline of enrollments
- Students stop enrolling because of low quality
- Blackboard and Web CT
- Provides framework and shrinkways courses
- IS currently used as a supplement (UNEX, Physical and Life Sciences)
- Different from total delivery of courses
- Its only a webpage to present course content, but sometimes there is videostreaming
- Can’t deliver practicum and lab content online
- WASC: services and content quality will need to be defined by UC
- WASC polices federal grant dollars for accredited academic programming

OID’s involvement with a broader construct.

- First role is diagnostic.
- Ask why a course would use media.
- Prevent unnecessary costs and frustration.
- The focus is on educational goals and then guide the faculty to the best mode of delivery
- How to enable the faculty to innovate.
- Does OID support Masters professional degree programs online?
- OICD campuswide the campus network with new tools but maybe not an expert for example with Web CT.
- E-physicis looks at simulations shareware.
- Create small clearinghouse for faculty tools

Hybrid instruction

- UC college prep: 5-year-old initiative. Student expectations for option of online instructional program
- Build a construct to support innovation in a more centralized way.
• Professional degrees are also monitored by accreditation agencies, but not necessarily at the undergraduate level.
• Investment when initially establishing hybrid courses.
• Students like to review materials more frequently.
• Example of online course: Stats 10 allows for online quizzes to test learning of each phase.
• Courses can benefit from web assistance but how much could be put online without risking quality.
• Can’t deliver everything in a pre-packaged format.
• Reaching rural students is not driving this demand.
• Courses online are more attractive because it allows options to take courses that otherwise would not be able to take because of scheduling conflicts.
• UCLA doesn’t have anything to gain from online instruction. Meeting mandates with no real demand. If UC is required to increase its students then would support hybrid instruction (D. Rigby)
• Students have more social, intellectual responses for coming to campus. Older students may have more demand for online. Legislature looking more towards getting students through degree.
• How would we count faculty workload? Workload definitions are still in negotiation.
• The online instruction is always considered a faculty resource solving tool but it looks like more work.
• Problem-solving is driving this issue.
• UC-wide instructional programs to provide curricular gaps for academic programming.
• Student can enroll in courses while on-site at another UC campus.
• Social science computing relationship.
• Structure to improve coordination at divisional level and at UC-wide level.
• Web-based models for instructional training.
• Short statement on content & services must refer to OID to notify of this kind of instructional program and refer to other faculty.
• CIMS used as a tracking system form ode of instruction.
• SAKAI: consortium working on tools that could be used locally.
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Dean Robert Lapiner, University Extension, was invited to discuss online instructional programs provided by UNEX. He provided the committee with UCLA Extension in its Context, and brochures for UCLA Extension online.

Themes that emerge in the discussion of online instruction:
• Contrary to intellectual property issues (faculty interests)
• Displace regular programming (research university not able to be delivered online).

University of Phoenix Model
• Offers degree programs with higher fees assigned.
• Addresses learning patterns of older students.
• Retain this market by offering online courses.
• Concern with losing onsite UNEX students.

UNEX was forced to enter a private partnership with OLn to pay for start-up costs including marketing.
• Infrastructure developed to benefit all students.
• Not as Bruin online which was not designed for UCLA online but now being used for this purpose.
• UNEX is now autonomous from private partner now.
• 15% increase in enrollments for online courses.
• L.A. county large percentage of enrollments. UNEX is targeting areas of outreach.
• Web-based commerce with customer service requires infrastructure.
• Faculty and students shouldn’t have problems with technology.
• Programmers in courses to assist faculty and students to improve quality. This was originally paid for by the partner.
• Instructors training program required (inc. UCLA faculty)
• Students training program required.

Small UNEX courses such as Writing Programs with an enrollment cap of 15.
• Instructors design courses.
• 6 week courses are also offered.
• Samples of course organization were distributed.
• Pre-assessment to admit students (self-assessment) and modify syllabus for course.
• The major growth is in complete curricula (certificate and degrees) or courses that are applied for credit.
• High satisfaction rate 85-87% for the certificate courses (e.g., college counseling certificate)
• Retention rate in UNEX courses also high.

What does UNEX do effectively?
• Mechanisms for online strategies
• Course manager with the class
• Centralized infrastructure
• Blackboard used by UNEX

Obstacles re the residency requirements for UCLA students
• Online instruction requires a lot of investment in faculty time.
• UNEX works most well for post-bacc students, undergraduates courses, but not undergraduate degrees
• UNEX outsource for a department to offer undergraduate courses online
• UNEX to assist in course design
• UNEX role would need to be defined.
• Course manager role would need to be defined
• Blackboard, data, track students, conduct complaint process, undergraduate advisor.

Growth related to online component and not content?
• Working with Engineering re certificate degrees
• Working with growth in Masters degrees
• UNEX articulated masters with departments
• Refer to CSU system for teaching masters programs
• Refer to NYU to articulate certificate programs

The Dean asked the committee to consider programmatic collaborations and not just infrastructure support.
• Expand curricular offerings.
• Master of Advanced Study concept to expand collaboration
• Master plan discussion would need to be revised
• UNEX experience with deciding instruction online vs. onsite? This is a combination of demand, area of study, and teaching mode.
• No master plan to convert courses online.
• Costs for instruction: UNEX fees are low but recovering costs for online courses.
• Average enrollment of 15 at $500/course
• Making costs but can't charge more to do more.

• Speaking mainly to masters level students
• Undergraduate courses not as large % of UNEX online courses
• The discussion of Undergraduate instruction will exclude degrees.
• Drivers for undergraduate courses (decide online vs. onsite)
• Hybrid vs. complete course online.
• High level of satisfaction but increased workload.
• Impacts concept of profitability.
• Examine role of ladder faculty, lecturer, TA, instructors.
• Essential: Issues of support, program representatives (course managers)
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The work group concluded that at present it will not be necessary to create new policy, but to explore ways to accomplish the instructional formats within current policies. The transition of multiple teaching modalities must include the CIMS categories.

Contact hours: e-mail exchange to respond to questions and FAQ's
Course credit: content of course is the measure whether in or out of the classroom.
Need to expand the definition of instructional contact hours including a formula for workload credit.
Undergraduate courses: a hybrid form or blended course is the national model

Outline for the Report (reference the December 17, 2004 charge letter to the group):

1. Current requirements: Academic residency
   • SR694 and SR512
   • Recommendation to draft SR695?
   • All regulations apply to Master's programs only
2. New regulations
   • SR695 will need to be explored if new regulations are needed.
3. New methods of evaluation must be defined
   • Security for exams
   • Physical locations for exams
   • Infrastructure identified for online
   • Evaluation of instruction remains the same

Second list of questions:

1-3. At this time, the workgroup recommends preserving the in class undergraduate experience, and does not recommend offering undergraduate courses completely online. It will be necessary to explore the infrastructure and teaching guidelines required to prepare a blended undergraduate degree program. However, any courses should be identified as completely online or blended as soon as they are established. Sabean's documents related to course forms can move forward in 2005-06
4. Face-Face instruction
5. Exam monitoring
6. No. Review the policies for self-supporting fees vs. state supported programs.
7. Yes. Intellectual property has not been an issue.
8. State vs. self-supported programs will have different workload measures.
Online falls within two categories. The question is the fee model e.g., Management case model. The second question is compensation and evaluation for the online vs. face-face instruction. This includes the issues of quality, support, and training.
9. The infrastructure is mixed depending on the discipline.
10. This question is no longer a relevant issue.