

**Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience (CTLSE)
Annual Report
2020-2021**

To the Irvine Divisional Assembly:

The Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience (CTLSE) respectfully submits its report of activities for the 2020-21 academic year.

I. COUNCIL OPERATIONS

Andrea Henderson, Professor, English, chaired the Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience (CTLSE) in 2020-21. The Council met nine times during the academic year. Attending regular CTLSE meetings were twelve elected faculty members, the Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning and Dean of the Division of Undergraduate Education (DUE), the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Division, the Chair of the Board on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Financial Aid (BUSHFA), the Librarians Association of the University of California, Irvine (LAUC-I) Representative, the Director of the Center for Engaged Instruction (CEI), Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, two representatives from the Associated Graduate Students (AGS), and two representatives from the Associated Students of University of California, Irvine (ASUCI).

II. COUNCIL ISSUES

A. ASUCI – the Need for Asynchronous Learning

Meeting Date: 10/5/2020

On September 7, 2020, ASUCI submitted a letter to the Academic Senate and CTLSE that recommended asynchronous learning for Fall Quarter in an effort to make instruction more equitable for students who may be living in a number of different time zones. On September 10, 2020, Senate Chair Barrett sent a letter to faculty urging that recorded lectures be available whenever possible and “to carefully consider how to best assess student learning during this time.”

This has also been an issue regarding student access to internet and technology. Asynchronous learning calls for creativity and flexibility for faculty with all students and requirements. The option to record lectures is being widely considered by instructors. A member suggested that students be given permission to turn off cameras during instruction, as many may find it stressful to appear or may have home environments that make appearing on camera difficult. The issue of cheating was discussed, and a member stated that it may be a good assumption that students have the best intentions not to cheat. The Council will continue to monitor remote instruction issues.

B. Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 544

Meeting Date: 10/5/2020

UC Senate Chair Gauvain circulated proposed revisions to Senate Regulation 544. The revisions were intended to facilitate UC student access to courses offered on

other UC campuses by clarifying certain aspects of the cross-campus course enrollment process.

Members had no issues with the proposed revisions and chose not to opine.

C. Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 630

Meeting Date: 10/5/2020

UC Senate Chair Gauvain circulated proposed revisions to Senate Regulation 630 (the “senior residency requirement”). The revisions were proposed by the University Committee on Educational Policy. Members had no issues with the proposed revisions and chose not to opine.

D. Systemwide Review of the Report of the Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force

Meeting Dates: 10/5/2020, 11/2/2020

The Council reviewed the Report of the Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force forwarded by Systemwide Senate Chair Gauvain. Last year, the Academic Council formed this task force to examine the implications of creating full-time, online, undergraduate degree programs at the University of California. Its July 2020 report provides three distinct policy options and outlines the strengths and weaknesses of each.

Option 1 (UC-Quality On-campus Degree) would prohibit fully remote undergraduate degree programs and require at least one-third of all major units and also one-third of total units to be earned in non-remote courses;

Option 2 (UC-Quality Remote Degree) would support the formation of entirely remote degree programs, but require that programs meet all ordinary expectations for a UC degree;

Option 3 (Instruction-Only Remote Degree) would allow fully remote degree programs that satisfy the same coursework expectations as UC’s face-to-face programs, but may not guarantee equivalent out of classroom opportunities.

Members admired the thoughtfulness of the report and thought the issues it raised merited further discussion. Some members argued that it would be short-sighted to disallow any of the three options without due consideration, while others reminded the Council of the special value of the on-campus experience and urged that we consider all aspects of the UC student experience in our determination of what constitutes a “UC-quality” degree. If we did offer online degrees, how could we best ensure that students have some access to the social and practical support systems that are so central to on-campus life? One member noted that option #2 has the virtue of engaging students in a learning community even in the context of an online-degree program. Going forward, members thought it particularly important to consider many issues.

We need fully to understand who the potential audience for a given online degree program is, bearing in mind that the structure and feasibility of a program bears a direct relationship both to the discipline on which it focuses and the population it is

intended to serve. Graduate and professional programs, for instance, often serve older students whose needs are more circumscribed and more easily defined.

If our primary goal is to make degree programs available for students whose location, jobs, family responsibilities, or finances make attending on-campus courses difficult, how can we best ensure that the programs we design will meet those specific needs? What will be distinctive about UC online degree programs in terms of their accessibility compared to those offered by other institutions, including community colleges? What are the data that show we are potentially losing qualified applicants from this pool of students who need online programs? What number of such students would likely choose to go to those institutions that already offer such online degrees (which may or may not be as good as ones that we might offer), rather than attend campus-based UC programs?

We need to consider career impacts for students with credentials from these programs since they differ from traditional UC degrees. How does the UC system articulate whether or not there is a clear added value in the campus experience? If there is a value to that experience, how will students getting an online-only degree have access to experiences of equal value (or, alternatively, pay less for their degree).

E. Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC)

Meeting date: 11/2/2020

Guest: Katie Tinto, Assistant Clinical Professor of Law, School of Law, and Chair, PSAC

The Council was presented with general information on the role of PSAC, current issues, and goals for this year and beyond.

A subcommittee of PSAC is reviewing policing on campus. An outside consultant, Michael Davis, assisted with the review by meeting with senior campus leadership, the Chancellor, and the Chief of Police. His contact information is available for any members who may wish to contact him. The review includes examining policing data such as how calls were addressed, stop data, and racial issues. PSAC is looking for areas of praise as well as training needs. The PSAC website is under revision. PSAC will currently serve as UCI's Policing Task Force. A member questioned how PSAC members were appointed, and it was explained that it was unclear, but that the Committee is under the Division of Finance and Administration, and Vice Chancellor Ron Cortez specifically. The review will address whether PSAC will or should have oversight of campus policing. A member stated that members of PSAC should not be appointed by administration for legitimacy purposes.

A member questioned why Mike Davis was chosen as the consultant, and it was explained that he was vetted through current members, is an expert on campus policing, and a former police chief. The roles of the Irvine and Newport Beach police departments and the Orange County Sheriff regarding the UCI campus and students was discussed. It was stated that a better relationship between these entities and a better understanding of student issues would be beneficial.

PSAC is also looking at budgets for policing.

F. Instruction and Research Issues Relating to China, Hong Kong, and U.S.-China Relations

Meeting dates: 11/2/2020, 12/7/2020

Memo date: 12/8/2020

The Senate Cabinet recently met with Jeff Wasserstrom, Professor and Chair of History, to discuss issues related to China, Hong Kong, and U.S.-China relations. Specifically, controls on freedom of expression have been tightening across the mainland. There are also technical issues such as some websites that are routine to access in the U.S. being off limits in China. He provided suggestions and useful links for instructors.

Members appreciated the urgency and important considerations raised in this discussion. Committee conversations added additional areas of concern involving UC Irvine students who are participating in online learning during the Covid-19 pandemic. Students are spread out across the world during this remote academic school year, and instructors cannot accurately assess how safe and secure all of their class members feel engaging in discussions or course work within these varied home environments. Professor Wasserstrom's memo noted that many students from the People's Republic of China are also taking classes remotely from around the world and that a new National Security Law in Hong Kong criminalizes many statements that would have been unproblematic six months ago, while more topics are being deemed politically sensitive by the Chinese Communist Party. The Council expressed concern over this issue, and extended these privacy and teaching considerations to students beyond China who are learning from homes that might not be conducive to the kind of freedom of expression and critical thinking that occurs in the safe spaces of physical classrooms during a normal academic school year at UC Irvine. For example, some UC Irvine students may be in home situations where other household members can overhear or monitor their discussions about racial or ethnic identity, history, government, gender and sexuality, religion, politics and many other potentially sensitive topics. Several committee members raised privacy and safety concerns for students who might not feel comfortable engaging in open discussions at home, or who might even be shamed or punished for participating.

The committee agreed that the following pedagogical suggestions raised specifically for international students from China or other countries should also be considered when teaching all UC Irvine students during this pandemic and period of remote education: 1) Not requiring that videos be turned on for discussions; 2) Allowing students to discuss potentially sensitive topics one-on-one rather than in group discussions; 3) Not recording and distributing discussions or office hours; 4) Including a warning on your syllabi that the class contains potentially sensitive material and offering to talk with students individually before they enroll; 5) Encouraging students to enroll in the class after we've returned to face-to-face instruction if the class is not required and contains potentially sensitive material; 6) Taking note of the difficulty students may have accessing some materials freely when they are being monitored or supervised at home (for example: if a student is

living in a religiously conservative home that does not support LGBTQIAP rights, yet the student is asked to purchase books or download materials around such issues, they might be banned from accessing the course readings due to rules within their home).

As a note, another member suggested that David Kaye in the Law School would also be an excellent resource on these issues, as he directs the International Justice Clinic and is the former United Nations Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression (2014-2020).

A proposed draft memo to faculty regarding this issue and including recommendations was included in the Council's response.

G. Faculty and Staff Mental Health

Meeting date: 12/7/2020

Guest: Negar Shekarabi, Coordinator of Faculty and Staff Support Services, Wellness, Health Counseling

The Council was presented with updates on faculty and staff mental health and resources. Specifically, the current state of faculty and staff mental health during the pandemic and any pandemic-related additional resources that are being provided or could be provided.

Behavioral health resources for faculty include Faculty/Staff Support Services, medical plan benefits, HR Wellness Programs, and the Employee Assistance Program (EAP). All services are still being offered virtually/remotely. However, there has been a small dip in the utilization of services during the pandemic. Concerns are the same pre- and post-pandemic, and those include relationship issues, occupational issues, depression, stress, and anxiety. Other faculty support services include Complainant Support Services, CARE Advocates, and Respondent Services.

Respondent Services are now under the Campus Social Work Office. Faculty/Staff utilization of these services has increased. Use of services by the UCI healthcare staff has increased. Outreach and education for staff and departments has increased and has focused on navigating uncertainty, creating work-life balance while working from home, and managing social unrest and difficult dialogues around race. It was explained that there are dual role and role conflicts within this area, as Faculty and Staff Mental Health and Complainant Support is provided by the same clinician. Negar is working on a proposal to grow and improve this area and will update the Council at a later date.

The Council will invite Negar Shekarabi to a meeting in 2021-22 for updates.

H. Board on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors, and Financial Aid (BUSHFA) – Proposed Modifications to Latin Honors

Meeting date: 12/7/2020

Memo date: 12/14/2020

The Board on Undergraduate Scholarships and Financial Aid (BUSHFA) would like to recommend to CTLSE that existing Regulation 415 be modified to adopt an option that would maintain the existing percentages for Latin Honors but rely solely on students' GPAs and standardize the process via the Registrar. While 16% would remain the goal each year, minor year-to-year deviation from the 16% figure would be expected and permitted since the GPA cutoffs would be determined in advance. This standardized approach would streamline the process for schools and provide clarity to all students about what is required to graduate with Latin Honors, including the exact range they may wish to work towards in their final year at UC Irvine.

Members expressed concern with using GPA as the sole criteria for awarding Latin Honors, as some Schools and disciplines may require other metrics to determine eligibility. Members voted unanimously that the proposal should include a statement allowing more flexibility to Schools in awarding the 16% of Latin Honors.

CTLSE would like BUSHFA to consider the possibility of implementing its new plan as the normative one for the determination of honors while still giving schools the option of “opting out” and devising a system for themselves that does not rely solely on GPA. This way, BUSHFA’s two aims in making the change—producing clarity for students and administrative simplicity for schools—would largely be met (since most schools prefer to rely on GPA alone). At the same time, schools that considered criteria other than GPA to be important could still make use of those criteria, with the understanding that they would be tasked with implementing those criteria and making their selection process transparent for their students.

The Council submitted these concerns and recommendations to BUSHFA.

I. Systemwide Review -- Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)

Meeting date: 12/7/2020, 1/11/2021

Memo date: 1/20/2021

Systemwide Senate Chair Gauvain forwarded for review the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative assessment report and recommendations for the future.

The reviewers’ stated investment in producing a recognizable brand in the name “UC Online” prompted concerns that this program would be a step toward an online UC degree, a step to which members would strongly object. One member expressed concern that the decision to direct funding away from specialty courses and toward high-demand courses would make the program less useful for expanding our curricular offerings while encouraging departments to “resolve” faculty staffing problems with a sub-par pedagogical “solution” that would then become entrenched.

Members agreed that non-matriculated students should not be included in the program. There was concern that ILTI had no budget plan to cover the expense of hiring T.A.s for larger courses. As it stands, that expense would fall entirely to the host institution. There was a complaint that the CCES can lead to curricular anomalies when departments on one campus are asked to produce “equivalent” or requirement-fulfilling courses to meet the needs of other campuses.

It was suggested that the best way to distribute funds for this type of program would be to provide block grants to individual campuses. This would minimize competition with other UC campuses and allow decisions to be made at the local level. A system for accountability was strongly encouraged to review the use of funds.

J. Student Mental Health and Wellness

Meeting date: 1/11/2021

Guest: Dr. Frances Diaz, Director, Counseling Center

The Council was presented with updates on student mental health and resources, specifically, the current state of student mental health during the pandemic and any pandemic-related additional resources that are being provided.

Prior to the pandemic, there had been an increase in demand for counseling services, challenges involving access and availability, and counseling staff turnover and burnout issues. For the 2019-20 academic year, there was a decrease in unique clients. This is most likely because of the numerous relocations, technology fatigue, and other factors that kept unique clients from reaching out for services. Overall, there have been increases in the total number of clinical visits and group services, and a focus on creating better online engagement.

Group services have no limits on visits. There is a separate set of group services for graduate students. Junior and senior undergraduates and graduate/professional students make up the majority of students seeking services. The impact of COVID-19 and other current national events has led to increases in substance abuse, racial trauma, depression and anxiety, isolation and loneliness, financial concerns, dating/domestic violence and stalking. The CARE office has been relocating students involved in dating or domestic violence and stalking incidents.

Services currently available include telebehavioral health services, social media engagements, and other resources at <https://counseling.uci.edu/resources/Wellness-Resources-during-COVID-19.html>. Therapy Assisted Online (TAO) Self-Help is also available. There will be an increase in need when “normalcy” returns. These issues will most likely include academic difficulties and an increase in Disability Services registrations. A member expressed concern regarding psychiatric services. It was explained that the campus psychiatrist was now located at the Health Center, where there was a greater need. The Counseling Center may look at a joint appointment in the future. It was suggested that faculty have mental health resources available on their syllabi. Faculty are welcome to reach out to Dr. Diaz directly with any questions or concerns.

The Council will invite Dr. Diaz to a future meeting for updates.

K. Career Pathways

Meeting date: 1/11/2021

Guest: Suzanne Helbig, Associate Vice Provost, Division of Career Pathways (DCP)

The Council was presented with updates on career advising for students, and particularly how recruitment and interview processes are being facilitated and evaluated.

DCP services help students navigate from coursework to career. Services include internships, career counseling, job shadowing, career panels, career assessments, and employer information sessions. Services with employers and graduate schools include internships, career and internship fairs, graduate and professional fairs, first-round interviews, and networking events. More specific career-related services include internships, resume reviews, practice interviews, job search workshops, and career readiness skills articulation.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, new virtual services and tools include: virtual fairs and information sessions, Instagram live, live person web chat, podcasts, online assessments, and resume books. “Jobs in the Time of COVID: What we Know Now” is a program directly addressing current issues. There has been record-setting attendance in programs, services for new alumni, and an expansion of the University Studies internship class. Career Readiness Education is available for campus staff and faculty.

In Summer/Fall 2020, participation in workshops and outreach increased significantly. Drop-ins were discontinued and participation in scheduled appointments increased. Student engagement was stable, job listings decreased, and internships increased. In Fall 2020, employer and student career fair attendance decreased, but data on attendance and engagement was tracked more easily.

The Council will invite DCP to a meeting in 2021-22 for updates.

L. Remote Instruction Best Practices

Meeting dates: 2/1/2021

Guest: Di Xu, Associate Professor, Education

Members were presented with an overview of current research on remote instruction and discussed frameworks for successful online educational environments.

Different types of students have adapted to remote instruction in different ways. Performance gaps between online and in-person instruction are wider for URMs, younger students, and students with lower levels of academic preparation/prior academic performance. Challenges include: learning course material independently, managing time wisely, keeping track of progress and course assignments, overcoming technical difficulties and feelings of isolation, and taking the initiative to communicate with instructors and peers.

The effectiveness of remote instruction could be improved by scaffolding skills, guiding processes, and enhancing student agency, presence, and interactivity. There is an Online Course Quality Rubric Matrix to guide instructors. Empirical evidence for the research was presented. Community building seems closely tied to student success.

M. Request for UROP Recommendations and the Faculty Advisory Board (FAB)

- 1. Meeting date: 2/1/2021*
Memo date: 2/8/2021

The Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (UROP) experienced transitions in 2020-21. Launched in 1995, UROP encourages and facilitates research and creative activities by undergraduate students from all schools and academic disciplines at UCI. UROP experiences have been an integral part of the undergraduate education of thousands of our students since that time. The Senate wants to ensure that UROP remains a robust and inclusive program moving forward and would like to consider which features and priorities are important for the future of UROP.

It was suggested that the role of the Faculty Advisory Board (FAB) be clarified. The FAB should have a formal charge that includes broader oversight of UROP, each school should be appropriately represented, and members should have clear term limits. The FAB had, traditionally, reviewed proposals, made recommendations on grant amounts, and advised the Associate Dean in the Division of Undergraduate Education (DUE) and UROP Director with the distribution of resources. Moving forward, it is strongly encouraged that the FAB be involved with decision-making regarding policies as well.

The Council will be following up with the Office of the Vice Provost of Teaching and Learning (OVPTL) and DUE in the near future regarding the recent transitions including the new UROP Director search, the role of the FAB, and any changes in policy or the distribution of resources.

- 2. Meeting date: 5/3/2021*
Guest: Sharon Parks, Interim Director, UROP

The Council was presented with updates on the recent UROP transitions and future goals.

384 projects have been funded thus far this year. The website has been redesigned and launched in February of this year. It also has information on other research opportunities outside of UROP. The UROP Symposium will be on May 21, 2021. There will be two oral presentations, posters, a keynote speaker, and an awards ceremony. There will be 500 students presenting and a total of 1,100 registered attendees. There have been workshops to prepare students on how to present.

Sharon has monthly meetings with the Faculty Advisory Board (FAB) and there will be a Summer retreat with the FAB. Sharon would like to collect more data on students including summer funding. Programs that have been put on hold during the UROP transition will be revisited/reviewed in the near future.

There is a partnership with OIR to streamline IRBs for proposals and to create a self-exempt process without allowing faculty to circumvent IRB requirements. UROP

has partnerships with donors as well as corporate partnerships and funding. There are three UROP advisors available to assist students.

The Council will invite a representative from UROP to present updates in 2021-22.

N. Optional Teaching Evaluations Reflection Form

Meeting date: 2/1/2021

Mike Dennin, Vice Provost of Teaching and Learning and Dean, Undergraduate Education presented information on a proposed form that would allow faculty the chance to make notes for self-reflection immediately after completing a term of teaching. Notes could be utilized at merit and promotion points to inform second pieces of evidence – such as reflective teaching statements. The notes could also be used while considering course design elements and implementing new teaching strategies.

Notes can be utilized at merit and promotion points to inform second pieces of evidence – such as reflective teaching statements. Notes can be utilized when engaging with DTEI staff or future DTEI graduate fellows when considering course design elements. Notes can be used to contextualize reviews when implementing new teaching strategies. The question format can be used to disseminate information about evidence based and inclusive teaching approaches.

Example questions were discussed. The form could be available when faculty access student evaluations. Option to complete form for X days/weeks after evaluations are released. Aggregate/de-identified data is available at the level of Departments/Schools/Campus for reporting on general usage of instructional approaches. Faculty have access to their individual responses for any future use, including optional integration into merit and promotion materials.

The Council will ask for updates in the future.

O. Academic Integrity Review Board (AIRB)

Meeting date: 3/1/2021

Guests: Annie Lai, Chair, AIRB and Assistant Clinical Professor, Law, and members of AIRB: Ali Mohraz, Professor, Engineering, and Vladimir Mandelshtam, Professor, Physical Sciences

The Council was presented with challenges faculty are facing with academic integrity in the remote learning environment.

Chair Annie Lai gave a brief overview of AIRB. The Board is charged with convening panels to hear student appeals of academic integrity cases. Additionally, it makes recommendations to the Office of Academic Integrity and Student Conduct (OAISC) on policies and procedures related to academic integrity. This past year, AIRB has made conforming changes to the policy to update references to different bodies on campus and better reflect current campus practice.

As the OAISC sees a broader cross section of cases than the AIRB, the Board meets with their office leadership periodically. The OAISC recently approached the board with a request that the Board consider a recommendation to the Senate to mandate regular academic integrity training for students. This will ensure that students receive reminders upon entering UCI and refreshers throughout their education here. The Board endorsed the recommendation at its last meeting by approving a revision to the Academic Integrity Policy that includes the requirement for all students to have academic integrity training. The OAISC would take the lead on developing the training itself in consultation with relevant departments. The OAISC is committed to including a wide breadth of hypotheticals in the training so that it is widely applicable to different disciplines. The training would also address plagiarism in addition to egregious cheating. Alternatively, the office would be a resource for departments that want to develop their own specific training.

A CTLSE member suggested that the training cover not only prohibited practices, but also include how to do things correctly. On the implementation of the training requirement, discussion on the logistics is ongoing. The Board envisions modeling enforcement of the requirement after existing training requirements such as the sexual harassment and cyber security training. This would depend on the capacity of different offices. A CTLSE member suggested that the training be linked to general registration for courses. It was noted that current mandatory trainings do not necessarily penalize students to the extent of suspension or dismissal from the university. Instead, over the course of the quarter, the students receive reminders to complete the training. At some point if the students do not comply, the student affairs office places a hold on the student's record which would affect their ability to enroll in classes.

There was discussion on the evidence to support the efficacy of such training. A member noted that the performance art training on academic integrity and student conduct used at orientation was supported by data. AIRB observed that the OAISC's expertise in working with students would inform the training. The more students are exposed to this training, the harder it is for students to claim ignorance.

On the challenges for instructors in the remote learning environment, AIRB suggested that it might be helpful to develop messaging to faculty related to academic integrity. The messaging would include a reminder to help students understand specific instructor policies on academic integrity through Canvas as a class announcement, give special thought to course policies for assignments and exams in the remote setting, encourage use of DTEI resources, and address use of online course sharing websites such as Chegg and CourseHero. The Board encouraged the reiteration of these messages throughout the term though particularly at the beginning of every course.

The Board also suggested that faculty provide a way for students to report incidents anonymously. There was discussion on how to define what constitutes a breach of academic integrity for individual departments. The current academic integrity policy describes general campus standards and provides a non-exhaustive list of types of violations.

The Council will invite AIRB to a future meeting for further updates.

P. Alternative Forms of Evidence of Teaching Excellence

Meeting date: 3/1/2021

Memo date: 3/22/2021

Evaluation of teaching plays a central role in the academic personnel process. Given that personnel actions require two forms of evidence concerning teaching, the Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience (CTLSE) was invited to reflect on alternative forms of evidence beyond traditional teaching evaluations. As an example, CTLSE could consider whether a program should be established by which faculty might, on a voluntary basis, request a peer evaluation of their teaching. Senate leadership has heard from faculty that support from the Division of Teaching Excellence and Innovation (DTEI) has been very valuable. CTLSE could consider a mechanism whereby a member of the DTEI team would both coach faculty and provide a report of teaching efficacy as a result of their interactions.

As it currently stands, the DTEI provides observations of teaching to faculty upon request. The observations are between the DTEI and the faculty member but can be shared with the consent of the faculty member. Some faculty members have been submitting these as a form of evidence of teaching excellence. However, these observations are not recommendations or evaluations of teaching.

If the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) would require a peer evaluation of their teaching, the DTEI would need to commit specific funding and design a program for more in-depth consultations.

Q. Academic Freedom Statement

Meeting date: 3/1/2021

Memo date: 3/5/2021

The UCLA Academic Senate Committee on Academic Freedom recently released a statement on academic freedom in the context of classroom instruction. CTLSE is invited to reflect on whether it might be helpful for the UCI Academic Senate to release a statement or guidance for faculty on this important subject.

The majority of members were not in favor of a formal academic freedom statement. Members expressed concern that a formal academic freedom statement may not address the inherent power dynamic between students and instructors and could be counter-productive to an inclusive environment. Members suggested the use of trigger warnings could be effective but should not be mandated. It was further suggested that it may be helpful to allow students to “opt-out” of particular readings, viewings, or assignments that may include sensitive issues or materials. If an Academic Freedom Statement is proposed, members of CTLSE would appreciate the opportunity to review and provide comments and recommendations.

R. Security Camera Policy

Meeting date: 3/1/2021

Memo date: 3/22/2021

At the February 16, 2021 Cabinet meeting, Thea Bullock, Director of the Public Records Office, presented members with the proposed policy for security camera use on campus. Following discussion, Director Bullock encouraged members to return to their Councils to get more feedback on the proposed policy.

Members advised that campus counsel be consulted regarding whether recordings could be released under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and how this policy might intersect with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). It was unclear whether there was a single campus designee directly charged with decision-making and safeguarding recordings.

It was unclear whether classroom space would be considered a “private space” or a “public area.” Members agreed that classroom spaces should be free from unnecessary surveillance scrutiny to preserve pedagogical freedom. It was advised that undergraduate and graduate students be consulted regarding this policy.

S. Expedited Review of Revised English Proficiency Policy for Teaching Assistants/Associates

Meeting date: Reviewed electronically

Memo date: 3/16/2021

Last academic year, as a result of union grievances involving several complainants, Senate Chair Steintrager convened a task force to develop a new English proficiency policy for Teaching Assistants and Teaching Associates. A new policy was implemented at the beginning of this academic year. However, following additional complaints and a subsequent investigation, the Office of Equal Opportunity & Diversity (OEOD) found that both the previous and current policies were discriminatory on the basis of citizenship and national origin.

A second, smaller task force was convened to expedite the development of a new policy. Chaired by former Senate Chair Steintrager, it also included representation from CEP and GC, the Division of Undergraduate Education, Program in Global Languages & Communication (formerly Academic English), and consultants from Graduate Division, Academic Personnel, and OEOD. The resulting policy was further reviewed by OEOD as well as Campus Counsel.

The Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience (CTLSE) solicited feedback from members via email due to the expedited review and had the following comment: “The new policy seems well-considered, and none of the members of CTLSE had any suggestions for improvement.”

T. Canvas Issues

Meeting date: 4/5/2021

Memo date: 5/17/2021

Guest: Erik Kelly, Instructional Technology Support Manager, OIT

The Council discussed issues with Canvas, and a potential campuswide survey of overall satisfaction with the program regarding small and large courses.

Canvas usage has increased dramatically. This is mostly due to the pandemic and the move to remote instruction, and that nearly all regular undergraduate courses are now using Canvas. Canvas support has also increased dramatically from 2019. Canvas's grades-related performance is impacted in larger courses. Performance impacts begin at around 500 students and include issues such as slowness in scrolling the gradebook, slow saving of grades and comments, and slow movement between SpeedGrader pages. These impacts worsen as the course size increases. "Course weight" is defined as the number of students in a course multiplied by the number of assignments. Courses with the largest "weight" may see some features not work entirely.

There are many limitations of sway with the Canvas vendor. Performance is something that the campus can only attempt to influence over time. OIT has had conversations regarding issues with vendor representatives repeatedly and has seen verbatim comments from instructors about the "performance penalty" in large courses. However, there is a limit to how much influence the campus can have to sway the vendor to address issues. Peer institutions are having the same issues. One possibility to relieve course weight is to use separate spaces for large lecture sections. However, these spaces may need additional TA's for each space, and content must be copied into each space (and revised in each space when needed). OIT assured the Council that it will continue to bring these issues to the vendor's attention.

The Council recommended that there be an FAQ for Canvas as well as a campuswide survey for particular Canvas issues and suggestions to ease major issues.

U. Revisions to Appendix II: Grade Appeals

Meeting date: 4/5/2021

Senate Chair Barrett stated that it would be helpful to update the text of Appendix II: Grade Appeals in the Academic Senate manual. This appendix was most recently revised in 2018. Over the past year, it has become clear that the Senate should revisit the text to ensure that procedures are straightforward for all parties.

Revisions included clarifying the process, clarifying the role of the hearing panel and panel chair, and ensuring that the complainant and respondent have a clearer understanding of the process. Members unanimously approved of the proposed revisions. The revisions were forwarded to the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (CRJ) for approval.

The revisions were approved by Senate Cabinet and the Divisional Senate Assembly and were effective on July 14, 2021.

V. Review of First Day Complete Course Materials Model

Meeting date: 4/5/2021

Memo date: 4/12/2021

Last year, former Senate Chair Steintrager convened a task force to review student supplemental costs, including textbooks and other course materials, for which students are required to pay over and above registration fees and tuition. The task force was asked to consider whether the campus should make less expensive alternative options available to students when possible. The Council has been asked to review the First Day Complete program report and presentation prepared by UCI's bookstore partners at Barnes & Noble College and to consider whether this flat-fee model provides better affordability and access to course materials for our undergraduate students.

No members were in favor of this model, which limits students' freedom of choice and forces students in some majors to subsidize the more expensive materials required for students in other majors. Members remarked that there was no indication that students had been consulted regarding this model, and noted that the University would have no easy or fair way of keeping the student opt-out rate at 10% or lower. It was also unclear exactly what the bundled "materials" would include and whether the plan would be relevant for students in all majors. Members were concerned, moreover, that this "monopoly" model might have the unintended effect of encouraging publishers to charge higher prices for textbooks.

Members were in agreement that further conversations are needed regarding keeping the costs to students down. One member stated that some third-party systems had been helpful in bundling resources, and another suggested that publishers or providers could be contacted directly by instructors for free or lower cost materials. The library representative noted that the UCI Libraries could be provided with additional resources to assist students in obtaining materials at lower or no cost.

W. Systemwide Review of the Gold Book

Meeting date: 4/5/2021

Memo date: 4/12/2021

Systemwide Senate Chair Gauvain forwarded for review proposed changes to Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures, which are applicable to UC Peace Officers.

Members stated unequivocally that these policies and procedures are fundamentally flawed: they seem out of sync with current UCI policing practices and, more basically, do not reflect—or even mention—current debates regarding the link between policing and systemic racial injustice.

More specifically, members expressed concern that officers are given considerable latitude regarding the use of body-worn cameras. Members were also deeply troubled by the language around the "appropriate" use of force, which, again, seemed to allow too much room for officer discretion and to be insufficiently

attuned to the real health implications of the techniques described. Members questioned, in fact, whether campus police should be permitted to use force at all.

X. Late Opt-Out Requests for Public Student Evaluations

Meeting date: 4/5/2021

Memo date: 4/8/2021

CTLSE recently received an email from an instructor regarding an opt-out request for public student evaluations that was past the official deadline. In October 2013, the then Council on Student Experience (CSE) voted unanimously to eliminate the late opt-out request option (standing by the deadline as posted online), and to remove the Senate address for late opt-out requests. The Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience (CTLSE) discussed whether to grant this particular request and whether there should be any changes to the process.

Members unanimously approved this particular request and did not move to alter the current standard process. However, it was suggested that a more efficient process for late requests should be explored through IT.

Y. UCI Athletics

Meeting date: 5/3/2021

Guests: Shauhin Talesh, Professor, Law, and Faculty Athletic Representative; Paula Smith, Director of Athletics; Alexis McDonald, Assistant Athletic Director - Academic & Student Services; Erica Monteabaro, Senior Associate Director Student Services; Megan Nicholson, Assistant Athletic Director, Compliance; Sam Nieto, Student-Athlete

The Council was presented with the Report on the Academic Performance of UCI Student Athletes for 2019-20 and updates within Athletics.

Athletics and student athletes experienced a unique and challenging year due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Campus partners helped provide opportunities and develop protocols and student athletes sacrificed and committed to the protocols to be able to practice and compete safely. Student athletes were provided the opportunity to “opt out” and maintain their roster spot and athletic scholarships.

The overall GPAs for student athletes for 2020-21 (up to Winter Quarter) were displayed. The female average GPA was 3.37 and the male average was 3.15, with an overall student athlete GPA of 3.25. There were 124 students on the Dean’s List for Fall 2020 and 132 for Winter 2021. There were 11 graduate student athletes.

Services offered during the pandemic included: mental health resources, weekly meetings with academic and student services staff, office hours held for coaches and student athletes that did not meet with staff regularly, tutoring and access to LARC courses, career development through Career Pathways, and partnerships with academic advisors.

Sam Nieto explained that the protocols and setbacks were difficult for student athletes, but the staff and administration were helpful in keeping students engaged. There was a drive-thru graduate sash pickup for athletes that was encouraging, and there have been alumni spotlights and Zoom presentations to improve engagement. Teams are grateful for the assistance with the pandemic situation and are looking forward to getting back to “normal.”

Z. Systemwide Review of the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program

Meeting date: 5/3/2021

Memo date: 5/12/2021

Systemwide Senate Chair Gauvain has forwarded for review the SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program. The proposed policy would require students, faculty, academic appointees, and staff who are accessing campus facilities at any UC location beginning this fall to be immunized against SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19.

Members expressed concern regarding how this policy would affect international students and their ability to attend in-person classes, particularly since not all countries have approved the same vaccines. Members questioned how the costs of testing those who have not been vaccinated or receive accommodations for the vaccine would be covered.

AA. Review and Revision of Student Course Feedback Form

Meeting date: 5/3/2021

Memo date: 5/7/2021

This academic year the Senate implemented the new student course feedback form developed by CTLSE, and strongly encouraged all units to adopt it for use in undergraduate courses. Since that time, we have received positive feedback on the form, as well as some recommendations. Senate Chair Barrett has asked the Council to consider the addition of a question related to equity and inclusion. It is also requested that the Council review the form for any other minor tunings it may wish to make ahead of the new academic year. For example, the Council might consider the addition of a “no opinion” or “not applicable” option to the Likert scale questions or consider inviting the student to explain why they feel the way they do on the open response questions.

Members agreed that the question related to equity and inclusion should be included. However, the word “respectful” should be omitted. The addition of a “no opinion/not applicable” option should be added to the Likert scale questions.

BB. UCI Commencement 2021

Meeting date: 5/3/2021

Guest: Kelly Carland, Director of Commencement and Special Events, Student Affairs

The Council was presented with updates and plans on UCI Commencement for 2021.

There will be a virtual ceremony on June 12, 2021. There will be School-based ceremonies with personalized aspects from departments. Graduates will be recognized with their name, a slide, and a message. “Stage moments” will be June 13th-17th from 8am-7pm at the Bren Events Center. There will be a 15 minute time slot for graduates.

Graduates can have up to two guests and can organize the timing with other graduates if they wish to do so. All attendees will be subjected to a security and symptom check. Graduates do not have to wear a mask for the official stage moment photo. There will be flower vendors and The Hill merchandise available. Graduate students will be able to have a hooder present and that hooder may be able to be in stage moment photo. Student Affairs has tried to put the student experience first. Members applauded the effort to provide a safe and memorable event for students under the circumstances. Additional information can be found at <http://commencement.uci.edu>.

CC. AIRB Proposed Modifications to Appendix VII

Meeting date: 5/3/2021

Memo date: 7/2/2021

Guest: Annie Lai, Assistant Clinical Professor, Law, and Chair, AIRB

The Council was presented with updates and plans on UCI Commencement for 2021.

The Academic Integrity Review Board (AIRB) proposed modifications to Appendix VIII. These modifications included the following: 1) Clarifications on student enrollment status and academic integrity violations; 2) A mandate for regular academic integrity training; 3) The addition of the option for an interpreter; 4) Conforming changes to Administrative Office name; 5) Grounds for an appeal for Option B hearings; 6) Sanctions for withdrawn or graduating students.

Members voted to endorse these revisions.

DD. Post-Pandemic Instructional Considerations

Meeting date: 6/7/2021

Memo date: 6/9/2021

Senate Chair Barrett asked the Council to consider the collection of issues raised by UCAF regarding post-pandemic instructional considerations, and any other topics salient in this context. Specifically, what role should the Senate play in reviewing various modes of instruction going forward? We need to think about how we define “hybrid” and whether and how hybrid courses might be reviewed. As one example, we currently require a supplemental questionnaire with proposals for fully online courses. More broadly, while recognizing a spectrum of instructional options from fully in person to fully online, and infinite ways that courses can be taught in hybrid

mode, the Council is asked to think about how we should consider these issues in terms of ensuring quality instruction for students (see APM 015.2.A) while keeping academic freedom in mind.

Members expressed concern with Canvas and other learning management systems regarding student data security. Members expressed concern regarding online courses and international students' residency requirements. A member expressed concern regarding equity and structural racism in terms of access to technology.

It was stated that there could be financial concerns with students who may not be able to afford housing near campus, and that some online or hybrid delivery would be helpful for those students in particular. Members agreed that instructors should be able to decide their modes of delivery, but that a list of best practices for teaching and protecting student data would be very valuable. Members generally agreed that the Council on Educational Policy (CEP) should be the body best suited to approve or deny online and hybrid courses, but reaffirmed that CTLSE should continue to be consulted regularly. Overall, members reached no real agreement on how post-pandemic instruction should be conducted, only that it should continue to be discussed.

EE. Draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan

Meeting date: 6/7/2021

Memo date: 6/11/2021

Systemwide Academic Senate Chair Gauvain has forwarded a draft Presidential Campus Safety Plan for review and comment. This plan lays a foundation for transforming UC's culture, policies and practices to achieve a vision of safety in which all members of the community feel equally welcomed, respected and protected from harm. This draft plan was developed based on extensive input from diverse groups of University of California stakeholders, including Campus Safety Task Force members, participants in the campus safety symposia held earlier this spring, and numerous conversations with students, faculty, staff and administrators

Members expressed concern regarding Action #4 of the draft, particularly regarding who will establish oversight and how the oversight body would be populated. It was suggested that, for Action #4.1.a, an advisory body should be independent, have its own resource allocations outside of any particular administrative umbrellas, and members should be elected, not appointed.

It was suggested that guidance on trauma-informed approaches should be included. Phrases referencing "community-based solutions" and "restorative practices" need to be more clearly defined. Members expressed concern that any prospect of abolishing campus police or other alternatives was not included. It was suggested that the particular expertise of faculty be included by way of a provision for consulting.

The definition of who will be "stakeholders" and "response teams" should be clarified, and faculty should be consulted for such roles. Members questioned how

this plan will move forward and how further comments would be solicited. It was suggested that a strategy for contributions and an outline for workgroups should be included.

III. NEW AND CONTINUING BUSINESS FOR AY 2021-2022

- A. Remote Teaching Issues and Concerns
- B. UROP
- C. Anti-Racism Efforts on Campus
- D. eSports
- E. Use of LMS Data by the OVPTL
- F. Management of Student Fees
- G. Academic Integrity
- H. Canvas Issues
- I. Celebration of Teaching Awards
- J. Student Housing
- K. Student Athletes
- L. UCI Undocumented Students
- M. Graduate Student Initiatives
- N. Instructor of Record
- O. UCI-UCIPD Community Relations
- P. ADA Compliance and Accessibility
- Q. Appendix II Revisions

IV. COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

Senate Members (voting)

Andrea Henderson, Humanities – Chair
Candace Burton, Health Sciences (Nursing)
Bernard Choi, Engineering
Mine Dogucu, ICS
Brandy Gatlin, Education
Erika Hayasaki, Humanities
Vipan Kumar, Medicine (Clinical)
Richard McCleary, Social Ecology
Francois Primeau, Physical Sciences
Ian Straughn, Social Sciences
Christine Suetterlin, Biological Sciences
Joel Veenstra, Arts
Patricia Wellmeyer, Business

Ex Officio Members (non-voting)

Michael Dennin, Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning
Gillian Hayes, Vice Provost for Graduate Education (or Court Crowther, Assistant Dean, Graduate Education)
Rameen Taleh, Assistant Vice Chancellor – Student Life & Leadership

Representatives (non-voting)

Stacy Brinkman, LAUC-I
Leah Chase, AGS
Mellisa Dahlin AGS

Phil De Vera, ASUCI
Sharon Kwon, ASUCI
Winston Hibler, ASUCI

Consultants (non-voting)

Andrea Aebersold, Director – Center for Teaching Excellence and Innovation

Council Analyst

Julie Kennedy