November 5, 2013

Jan Reiff
Chair, Academic Senate

Re: Response to Special Programs Task Force Report

Dear Jan,

The Committee on International Education (CIE) has reviewed the report from the 2013 Special Programs Task Force and has concluded that the Committee supports the recommendations pertaining to Summer Sessions and the International Education Office (IEO) contingent upon revision. In deriving the following opinions, the Committee has met repeatedly and solicited the opinions of ex-officio members of the Committee as well as the current IEO officer.

1. **Reporting Structure.** The document suggests in its conclusion that “given the cost and disruption of making organizational changes, the Task Force felt that these organizations should be essentially left intact with some minor adjustments.” The International Education Office currently reports to Glyn Davies, Associate Vice Chancellor Academic Planning & Budget, and we agree that maintaining this reporting structure is appropriate in the near term.

2. **Faculty Advisory Committee.** The document refers to a non-Senate faculty advisory committee that is charged with “evaluating travel study proposals submitted to the IEO.” While it is true that such a committee appointed by the International Institute did exist, we have learned that it was recently dissolved and there is currently no faculty oversight of study abroad programs.

We would thus like to emphasize that the existence of faculty-led oversight of education abroad programs is crucial and must be resolved. Given that virtually all courses proposed for study abroad programs are existing courses offered on campus, such a committee should not be preoccupied with evaluating these courses themselves. Rather, as the report notes, the “travel study programs involve both pedagogical and logistical aspects that are outside the normal scope of departmental expertise”, thus the oversight pertaining to the depth of teaching cadre, quality of teaching, security arrangements, financial or academic preparation, or any other issues deemed relevant to international education, would be appropriate for such a committee.

The report suggests that this role may be suited for a Senate committee, and if held true our understanding is that this would most likely fall to the CIE. However, assigning direct oversight of both new and existing travel study proposals to CIE might necessitate a significant expansion of the Committee’s purview. While we would not categorically oppose such a shift, we wish to emphasize that several factors need be considered:
• Membership: The Committee bylaws allot CIE nine members, only five of which are appointed faculty. In our opinion, this number may need to be increased in order to fulfill the Committee’s additional supervisory responsibility. In such case, problems might surface in obtaining adequate quorum for meetings or timely feedback from members. On the other hand, IEO staff should be able to provide individual expertise regarding study abroad in a variety of geographic regions. Hence the current number of CIE members might suffice as long as an adequate reporting structure is maintained by IEO and the CIE, in order to ensure that programs are given full consideration with the most current and accurate information and insight available.

• Meeting Frequency: We would also like to emphasize that the Committee would not want to delay or hinder the ability of programs to move forward, especially if they have already been vetted by IEO. As such, an expanded meeting schedule and lengthening of meetings would likely be required, and the appointees would need to be comfortable with the expanded time commitment as required. The CIE would consider inviting faculty with regional knowledge to individual committee meetings in order for them to share their expertise on a case by case basis with the Committee.

• Approval of Programs: Faculty interested in teaching a study abroad course must submit their request to IEO, which would remain responsible for conducting the primary vetting of the programs. Our understanding is that IEO would review all new proposals thoroughly prior to being placed before the Committee for final approval. If IEO has any concerns with a proposal (either new or existing), those may also be put before the Committee for comment and advice.

3. Renaming of the International Education Office. The Committee has no opinion on the Task Force’s recommendation to change the name of IEO to “Summer and International Programs” (SIEP) and will leave the branding of the organization to the discretion of the office itself.

4. Annual Reporting. The Committee supports the report’s recommendations on the proposed changes to the Summer Sessions annual report.

5. Online Education. While subjects such as MOOCs and other future endeavors related to online education at UCLA may not be under the current purview of the CIE, we feel that the link to international education would be inevitable whether per campus or UC-wide efforts. Thus, the Committee feels the need to echo the call by the Task Force to establish suitable organizational structure for leadership in this regard.

Thank you for allowing the Committee on International Education the opportunity to offer its perspectives on this report.
Sincerely,

Steve P. Lee  
Chair, Committee on International Education

Cc:  Jaime Balboa, CAO, Academic Senate  
     Mark Kaminsky, Policy Specialist, Academic Senate
November 5, 2013

Jan Reiff
Chair, Academic Senate

**Re: Response to Special Programs Task Force Report**

Dear Jan,

The Report of the 2013 Special Programs Task Force makes recommendations for several established programs (Summer Sessions, ROTC, UC in D.C., the International Education Office), and for the much more distributed, diversified, and less administratively-structured category of “online education” at UCLA. Given the brief of the Committee on Instruction and Technology (CIT), which to date has focused on online education and instructional technology more generally, the present response is confined to the Report’s recommendations with respect to online education.

Our first observation is that “online education” is unlike the other formal programs addressed in the Report, all of which operate outside of academic degree programs and have more or less separate, and centralized, administrative structures and operations. We are interested to see parallels being drawn between online education and the other programs, and the recommendation that, like these other programs, online education at UCLA should be administered or coordinated across campus by a single administrative unit, such as a centrally-reorganized and expanded Office for Instructional Development (OID).

CIT strongly supports the work of the OID and its staff. Under the leadership of Dr. Larry Loeher, and operating within the organizational structure of the College of Letters and Science, OID is an indispensable resource for pedagogy and learning, with some of the best instructional design expertise on campus. We would support any reorganization scheme that would substantially increase OID’s resources and make their services more widely available to units across campus, particularly to instructors in the professional schools.

That said, however, we do not think OID (or by extension, the Office for Information Technology, its proposed new home) should assume primary responsibility for creating or managing online instruction on campus, including the availability or allocation of technological infrastructure or facilities. The generation and development of curricula, course content, pedagogy, and evaluation is the responsibility of faculty and academic programs, no matter what techniques, facilities, or infrastructures are used. So, while a reconstituted OID may become a much richer resource for instructors across the whole range of departments and programs at UCLA (particularly those with smaller budgets or enrollments, or limited access to technology/production infrastructure or funding), we would prefer to see a federated, faculty-driven, cross-disciplinary network for online teaching and learning, along the lines of several successful models of research, scholarly and teaching collaboration already in operation on campus. We might even envision OID expanding to become the core professional staff/consultant component of the network.

One outstanding example is the Institute for Digital Research and Education (IDRE;
http://idre.ucla.edu), whose participating faculty and staff consultants help instructors and researchers across the university use quantitative analytic techniques, computation, and data visualization in their work. IDRE also supports more specialized cross-disciplinary collaboratives such as the Humanities, Arts, Architecture, Social and Information Sciences collaborative (HASIS) and the Hoffman2 Users Group (HUG). The Center for Digital Humanities (CDH; http://www.cdh.ucla.edu) offers another interdisciplinary organizational model designed to foster fluency with digital technologies among disciplinarily-diverse faculty and students. In the CDH, 35 faculty from 20 departments in the College and professional schools collaborate on scholarly projects and offer a specialized undergraduate minor and a graduate certificate.

Such a federated, faculty-driven network of academic peers and programs focused on well-designed, effective pedagogy would offer several advantages over a centralized administrative model focused principally on resource allocation and revenue. First, it would provide a concrete organizational structure for cross-disciplinary and cross-unit collaboration and teaching, an ideal that is often invoked at UCLA but infrequently realized or rewarded in practice. Second, a cooperative enterprise could encourage resource- and expertise-sharing, especially across programs and departments already challenged by budget and staff shortages and increased enrollment demands. Third, it could offer badly-needed faculty development and instructional capacity-building through mentoring, team-teaching projects, new modes of instruction that highlight faculty expertise and up-to-the-minute research and scholarship, and also, crucially, provide a means for recognizing and rewarding innovative instruction. This last point is especially critical for pre-tenure junior faculty who may be discouraged from devoting the enormous amounts of time and energy required to develop effective mediated instruction, or more senior faculty who may have some interest in new pedagogies, but few contacts with trusted, experienced peers, with whom they can cultivate new teaching skills.

Fourth, this type of network and its participating faculty, like existing “centers” around campus, could be a highly visible and attractive focus for development and endowment, especially as UCLA moves toward its upcoming capital campaign. For example, the Faculty Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Education & Information Studies, anticipating the “grand challenges” framework of the campaign, has sketched some preliminary ideas for an “institute for the design of transformative pedagogy,” ideally in partnership with a range of other academic units on campus with related interests in instruction and technology, evaluation, new forms of technologically-mediated knowledge, and serving the growing populations and underserved communities beyond those traditionally reached by the University of California.

This year our Committee will explore the factors that would help this kind of organizational model for online education succeed at UCLA. We appreciate the opportunity to reflect on the Task Force’s findings, and hope our comments are useful.

Sincerely,

Leah Lievrouw
Chair, Committee on Instruction and Technology

Cc: Jaime Balboa, CAO, Academic Senate
Mark Kaminsky, Policy Specialist, Academic Senate
November 1, 2013

To: Professor Jan Reiff, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Professor Leobardo Estrada, Chair
      Undergraduate Council

Re: Undergraduate Council Response to the Report of the 2013 Special Programs Task Force

On behalf of the Undergraduate Council, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to review and opine on the Report of the 2013 Special Programs Task Force. The membership discussed the report at its meetings on October 18 and November 1, 2013, and noted several concerns.

First, the overview of Summer Sessions seems to be based more on its function as a revenue generator than as an academic program. Leaving the direction of the program as an independent function of the individual departments and schools may make fiscal sense, but, strategically, it may not be the best way to assure the highest academic value from Summer Sessions. Furthermore, the Council disagrees with the suggestion that it or the Academic Senate should provide oversight to Summer Sessions, as the eight-year program review serves this purpose. Instead, a Faculty Advisory Committee should be appointed to assist with guiding the academic direction of the program.

Additionally, the Task Force report erroneously states that the 2010-11 ROTC program review report recommended that the program be moved from Social Sciences to the Division of Undergraduate Education. The review report recommended that the Executive Vice Chancellor consult with the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education to “consider ways to modify the current structure and configuration of the ROTC programs and the reporting line.” The Council is pleased that ROTC was included in the Special Programs Task Force report, but feels the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education’s viewpoint on the matter should have been included. Moreover, the report recommends that ROTC remain in Social Sciences because the program’s units “believe it is in their best interest,” but does not provide any specific information to support this claim. The membership also questioned the recommendation that ROTC establish a Faculty Advisory Committee, and would like clarification as to who would be ideal appointees for this committee as no ladder faculty members are currently involved with the program.

The Council is disappointed by the Online Education section of the report, which recognizes that the campus should look at Online Education from a problem-solving point of view, but does not discuss the problems to be solved, the priorities to be addressed, or the opportunities to be
seized. This is demonstrative of the lack of strategic planning on campus in regards to online education initiatives. A strategic approach in this regard demands immediate attention. Furthermore, suggesting that the Office of Instructional Development assume a "strategic approach" ignores the idea that the Provost and Deans are responsible for setting academic priorities – not an administrative support unit. Lastly and quite notably, the student perspective on these issues is glaringly absent.

Thank you, again, for the opportunity to provide feedback in response to the Report of the 2013 Special Programs Task Force and for considering the Council’s concerns. Please contact me (x56574; leobard@ucla.edu) or Academic Senate Policy Analyst Melissa Spagnuolo (x51194; mspagnuolo@senate.ucla.edu) if you have any questions.

cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Linda Mohr, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Melissa Spagnuolo, Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
The College Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) discussed the Special Programs Task Force (SPTF) at our October 18, 2013 meeting. We were aided in our discussion by a member of the taskforce, Professor Mark Morris, who provided a brief overview of the proposal. We appreciate Professor Morris' willingness to summarize the report's findings. After a lengthy and lively discussion, the committee voted to oppose the recommendations of the report and recommend that the administration reconsider the scope of the original charge (13 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain).

The SPTF report arose in response to Executive Vice Chancellor Waugh's request for guidance on “how best to manage a number of education programs” as longstanding questions about their management “have gained urgency as a result of recent transitions and changing educational needs.” The specific programs that EVC Waugh identified for review were Summer Sessions, the International Education Office, UCDC, ROTC, and online learning. EVC Waugh specifically asked the task force to “rethink where these programs should be located organizationally and how best to exercise faculty/Senate oversight” and in this context to identify the overriding principles of management or governance that best organize these efforts.

The FEC concluded that the task force did not adequately address the aims and objectives of EVC Waugh’s charge. Further, we are concerned that it was not possible for the task force to execute this charge for the following reasons:

1. The task force membership was weighted by individuals who held significant leadership roles in the programs under review. In our view, these individuals should have served as resources to a task force composed of more objective faculty and administrators. Although most likely an unintended effect, the outcome of this situation is a set of recommendations that advocate for continuation of existing structures (albeit with minor changes in oversight) that appear to be driven by financial goals and/or desire to maintain current space allocations. We do not think that the issue of space allocation rises to the level of an overriding principle of management or governance. Our committee would have preferred to see an explication of overriding principles of management or governance from which recommendations for specific organizational structure were developed. We believe recommendations must include a consideration of educational goals as well as financial goals. Moreover, we note that despite the Executive Vice-Chancellor’s call, the report does not provide a systematic mechanism for faculty oversight of educational issues.

2. The number of programs to address was too large for one committee. Although the FEC appreciates that EVC Waugh is seeking guidance on how best to organize a number of “special” programs, we felt that each program has a sufficiently unique history, context, needs, and set of constituencies, that a
single committee would not have enough capacity to adequately address all of them. This was clear not only from the uneven treatment of the programs in the report, but from the overall brevity of the report.

Apart from how the task force was constituted, the FEC identified several specific problems in the report: questionable methods of data collection in relation to Summer Sessions classes across a range of disciplines; lack of evidence to support broad claims about the educational success of UCDC; insufficient information that identifies the applicability and inapplicability of different types of online learning in relation to specific courses of study; and the role that UCLA Extension (UNEX) should play in some of these programs. We detail our concerns below.

Based on structural problems with the task force and its charges, and concerns with questionable or lack of evidence, the FEC recommends that the SPTF report be set aside and that the process be reconceived to ensure (1) objectivity, (2) reasonable workload for the committee(s), and (3) valid evidence-based recommendations. This may mean creating a large task force that works as subcommittees or may mean creating several distinct committees. This may also mean ensuring that the task force has access to data and support from data analysts.

Our specific concerns are:

**Summer Sessions**
The SPTF report asserts that Summer Sessions is an “extremely profitable and highly-used program,” and it includes a graph that reveals that the headcount has increased from 7,000 to 12,000 in the 1998-2012 period. The account of Summer Sessions presents this program as an unqualified financial success. Yet, had SPTF reported information from a broad span of departments, it would have discovered that not every academic unit reaps such assured financial rewards from Summer Sessions. Humanities departments, for instance, can find the costs of running summer classes unduly expensive. In fact, at least one department has begun discussions about whether it should impose a cap on faculty summer payments to ensure that classes remain profitable through the current cost-sharing model. We recommend that the reconstituted SPTF consider revisiting pages 4-5 of the current report after its members have reviewed data from a representative range of departments and academic units about the costs involved in providing classes for Summer Sessions. These shortcomings in the report are noticeable because the document later admits that there might be some problems with the present method for sharing costs. On page 7, the report states that the “new leader” of UCLA's summer programs “should be charged with increasing the activity occurring in summer and increasing the revenue returned to departments.”

Nor does the Report adequately address the question of the educational quality of summer sessions courses. Since some departments have to estimate the fiscal consequences of summer programs very carefully, they sometimes employ instructors who are not as expensive to hire as ladder faculty. It would be useful to have data that explains the status of the instructors (graduate student, adjunct, lecturer, part-time, visiting, ladder faculty, and so on) who teach summer programs in a range of departments and academic units. Therefore, the FEC would like to see a report that provides comments on the best ways that Summer Sessions might be strengthened with regard to the types of instructors leading its classes and the opportunities for student evaluation of the learning experience, especially when summer classes occupy a shorter number of weeks than the regular quarter.

**UCDC**
The FEC found this descriptive account of UCLA’s involvement in UCDC, housed in the Center for American Politics and Public Policy (CAPPP), to be an uncritical summary of the program’s “well-regarded success.” The SPTF report emphasizes that UCLA enjoys greater success than other UC campuses in recruiting
students to this program. The report also underlines that “the current arrangement” for UCLA’s participation in UCDC is “producing excellent results.” The report goes on to praise the “high quality, personalized experience” the program offers to undergraduate students. These statements are unqualified and without reference to data (e.g. student evaluations of the UCDC experience). Without a more complete reporting of this program’s activities, the conclusion that there may be a need for “slightly augmenting reporting,” seems without context or support. Most disturbing to our committee is the manner in which the report enlists “space allocation” as its overriding principle of management or governance for justifying why it should retain its reporting structure through the Division of Social Sciences. This is not a convincing argument and illustrates the importance of reconsidering the SPTF report. Until a more thorough review of the UCDC program can be scheduled, the FEC agrees with the recommendation that CAPPP’s annual advisory report to the Dean of Social Sciences should be shared with the Undergraduate Council.

**Online Education**

The FEC appreciates the SPTF’s assertion that “at UCLA efforts in online education should be driven by clearly articulated mandates regarding what specific problems are going to be solved or needs addressed.” Yet, the FEC was disappointed by the largely unbalanced (and uncritical) tone that the SPTF report adopts when discussing the “new and exciting” nature of online learning. Members of FEC commented extensively on the fact that recent studies of some online courses (particularly those that come under the acronym MOOC [Massively Open Online Courses]) can have serious educational drawbacks. Studies have shown that MOOCs can intensify passive learning, result in lower test scores, and have high dropout rates. To be sure, the FEC appreciates that certain types of online education may enhance students’ educational experience, but we maintain that UCLA needs to exercise caution in embracing these forms of electronic instruction since such courses do not automatically complement our institution’s mission.

The SPTF report recommends that the Office of Instructional Development (OID) should take the lead in serving the entire campus “strategically as well as tactically.” FEC finds it surprising that the SPTF report makes little mention of funding OID’s role in serving the campus’s online learning needs both strategically and tactically. Moreover, it is noticeable that the report finds no space in which to discuss the UCLA Library System’s increasing role in enhancing our students’ educational experience of online resources through such developments as the Research Commons in the Young Research Library and the recently installed InqLabs in Powell Library. The FEC urges the SPTF to engage with senior members of the library staff, with expertise in different disciplines, to assess the ways in which the UCLA Library system can engage with both faculty and OID in using online resources with the greatest educational benefit. In addition, the FEC noted that the Report did not adequately consider the authority of the Academic Senate in developing these programs assuming instead on the leading role played by the Vice-Provost for Instructional Technology.

The SPTF report also comments that UNEX should have a crucial role to play in UCLA’s development of online education. The report reasons that UNEX has more experience in this field of instruction than any other part of the UCLA community. The report, however, notes that UNEX remains isolated from many departments, and as a result, there has not historically been productive collaboration between the classes offered through UNEX and the courses taught on the main campus. The FEC concludes that the SPTF report has avoided discussing the most sensitive issue regarding the relations between academic departments and units, on the one hand, and UNEX, on the other hand--and several FEC members, representing several departments, expressed doubt about the quality of classes offered through UNEX. It is therefore a question

---

open to discussion about whether UNEX is the appropriate partner to lead a campus effort into quality online education.

The FEC recognizes that the SPTF report concludes on an unclear note about the ways in which OID, UNEX, the Office of the Vice Provost for Information Technology, and the Office of the Dean and Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education should interact in relation to the strengthening of online learning at UCLA. At a time when there is increasing pressure upon our campus to consider embracing online education in many different areas of study, the SPTF acknowledges that such pedagogical innovations involve many different parties. The FEC adds that little progress will be made in developing a critical framework for online learning until each of these offices begin to dialogue among themselves, but also with the University Librarian and the Vice Provost of Graduate Division.

Conclusion
We appreciate the work performed by the members of the SPTF and recognize that they have addressed some of the urgent matters arising from the EVC’s charge. The FEC nonetheless concludes that this report lacks the kind of information we expect from a document that focuses on UCLA’s mission to produce the highest caliber of student learning. We strongly recommend the formation of a new committee or committees as well as the development of new, better informed recommendations.

As always, our membership appreciates the consultative process and welcomes the opportunity to opine on important matters like this. You are welcome to contact me at cpalmer@mednet.ucla.edu with questions. Kyle Stewart McJunkin, Academic Administrator, is also available to assist you and he can be reached at (310) 825-3223 or kmcjunkin@college.ucla.edu.

cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
Lucy Blackmar, Associate College Dean, College of Letters and Science
November 1, 2013

Professor Jan Reiff  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Senate Item for Review: 2013 Special Programs Task Force

Dear Professor Reiff,

The Council on Planning and Budget reviewed the task force report at its meeting of October 21, 2013 with respect to its resource implications. The report examined the future reporting structure for Summer Sessions, the International Education Office, UCDC, ROTC, and on-line education as well as issues of management or governance.

No additional resource issues were raised besides those already noted in the report. Most of the units were either self-supporting or had well-established financial foundations. The two units noted for future examination were On-line education and UNEX. The growth and increased attention of on-line education suggests the urgent need for the campus to determine the costs and benefits of these wide-ranging applications. With respect to UNEX, they can both play a role in on-line education through its considerable experience as well as provide another pathway for on-line offerings to better serve our students. Additionally, UNEX has the capacity to provide departments with another avenue of revenue sharing through offering some on-line courses to the public.

No other issues were noted.

Sincerely,

Rosina Becerra  
Chair, Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Joel Aberbach, Vice Chair, Academic Senate  
Linda Sarna, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate  
Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Linda Mohr, Assistant Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
To: Jan Reiff, Chair/Academic Senate

From: Maite Zubiaurre, Chair/Graduate Council

Date: November 5, 2013

Re: Senate Item for Review – Report of the 2013 Special Programs Task Force

The Graduate Council considered the report of the 2013 Special Programs Task Force at its meeting on October 25, 2013. Graduate Council agreed with the conclusions of the SPTF, according to which there is no need to modify the existing reporting structure. The Programs under review (Summer Sessions, the International Education Office, UCDC, ROTC, and online education) were found to be in good health, and therefore, GC concurred, the SPTF is right in not suggesting significant organizational changes at this moment.

I am pleased to provide the following opinions from the Graduate Council, the bulk of which involve the report’s recommendations about online education at UCLA, which (unlike the other Programs discussed in the report) is not only geared towards an undergraduate population. But even in the specific instance of online undergraduate education, graduate students are directly implicated, the Graduate Council noted. The nature of online TAship and all the aspects of it (as, for example, the need to develop a comprehensive and rigorous Online education TA training program), is something that is of growing interest and concern, not only at UCLA, but at the UC-system level.

In principle members of the Graduate Council agree with the spirit of the report’s recommendations. Members observed that the report acknowledges the evolving landscape of online education at UCLA, but that it also asserts the need for the campus to have clearly articulated mandates for addressing specific problems and needs. Additionally, members appreciate the call to the Office of Instructional Development to have a broader and more proactive presence with respect to supporting the teaching enterprise across the entire campus. For the moment, OID is assigned to the Division of Undergraduate Education, a situation/location that could be revised in the future, since OID is also responsible also for supporting graduate education.

Members proposed more of a collaborative effort involving OID, UNEX and departments/schools with determining a campus strategy before such a charge is assigned to one administrative unit. Additionally, with respect to managing the University’s central investment in the selection and production of online courses, one member noted that several online courses are developed by adjunct faculty, who often deliver their courses at other local – and competing – institutions, which introduces concerns about intellectual property rights. The member surmised that OID may not be prepared to tackle such issues, further warranting the need to cast a wider net with respect to defining a campus-wide strategy for online education. It bears noting that the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils will be reviewing the Office of Instructional Development this month, with a specific request from EVC Waugh to consider the recommendations of this report during that review, which will no doubt enlighten the council members about the suitability of having OID play a more pronounced role for the campus.

More importantly, it was noted also that the efforts done in regards to online education on our campus have to be considered in the broader context of UC System-wide initiatives, such as ILTI. The Graduate Council members concurred that online education at UCLA needs to be attuned to what is presently discussed and developed at the UC level.
We appreciate the opportunity to opine on the document. We are looking forward to more fruitful discussions on this matter, particularly on the rapidly evolving issue of online education and its various implications vis-à-vis graduate education. If you have any questions related to our response, or specific requests for Graduate Council’s opinion on an issue that is not included in this response, please do not hesitate to contact me.

cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Linda Mohr, Assistant CAO, Academic Senate
    Kyle Cunningham, Policy Analyst, Graduate Council
    Serge Chenkerian, MSO/Executive Assistant, Academic Senate
To: Jan Reiff, Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

From: Jean-François Blanchette, Chair, GSE&IS Faculty Executive Committee

Date: October 31, 2013

Re: Senate Item for Review—Report of the 2013 Special Programs Task Force

On behalf of the Faculty Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, I write in response to your request for comments on the Report of the 2013 Special Programs Task Force. The GSE&IS FEC met on October 16, 2013 and discussed at length the section of the report (p. 15-22) concerned with online education. Members of the Committee expressed considerable concern with the institutional structure advocated by the report.

The report envisions that OID become a driver for online education on campus, recommending that OID “act in a more strategic way by reaching out to target groups of faculty to promote a specific solution to a campus need.” (p. 17) Members of the Committee felt that the OID’s role in online education should not be to drive, but to support faculty’s pedagogical initiatives. They felt that online education is providing the rationale to move such initiative beyond faculty control. If faculty are not perceived by their peers and by the public as educational entrepreneurs, with the power and institutional resources to imagine, develop, and teach courses that match their research expertise, University of California campuses will be hard pressed to distinguish themselves as teaching institutions from, for example, Cal State campuses.

The Committee noted that the move towards centralization implied in the report is at odds with the general move towards decentralization of revenue generation, where academic units across the campus are asked to develop new degrees and programs. Furthermore, the implied case for centralization is that “fully online” courses will require “extraordinary resources” beyond those usually accessible to faculty. Yet, fully online courses represent only one of the many possible models for greater integration of information technologies within the classroom, and one primarily driven by economic, rather than pedagogical considerations. Again, the Committee felt that the mandate of OID should be to support faculty as they experiment with different models of mediated instruction and explore their pedagogical possibilities and constraints. Members of the Committee suggested that such experimentation would have been well served if the report had included a comprehensive review of all online degrees currently proposed or offered at UCLA.
If you have any questions concerning this response, please do not hesitate to contact me.

cc: Jaime Balboa, CAO, Academic Senate
    Marcelo Suárez-Orozco, Dean, GSE&IS.
November 1, 2013

TO: Jan Reiff, Chair Academic Senate

FROM: Scott J. Brandenberg, Chair, HSSEAS Faculty Executive Committee

RE: Report of 2013 Special Programs Task Force

The Faculty Executive Committee in the Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science discussed the 2013 Special Programs Task Force report during our FEC meeting this morning. Feedback from our FEC was positive, and we endorse the report.

We discussed the possibility of making HSSEAS MS online infrastructure available to other campus units seeking to establish their own MSOL program. This makes sense (1) to reduce up-front costs other campus units may face in establishing an MSOL program, and (2) helping HSSEAS recoup some of its up-front cost on investment in the MSOL infrastructure. The Associate Dean of International Initiatives and Online Programs, Jenn-Ming Yang, is supportive of this idea. We feel this may be a win-win situation for HSSEAS and other campus units.

We agree with the Task Force recommendation that the Summer Sessions program should remain located where it is, and that re-organization is not needed. The program is working well, and we agree that no changes are necessary. We also agree that Summer Sessions should continue reporting directly to the EVC, and that these reports be forwarded to the Academic Senate and appropriate committees. Furthermore, we suggest that these reports should be shared with Department Chairs for feedback from Departments. This would help enhance transparency.