

Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate
Committee responses to Remote and Online Instruction at UC

Committee on Educational Policy

I am writing to convey CEP's response to the report of the Special Committee on Remote and Online Instruction and Residency. CEP does not dismiss the important role that online instruction can and will play. However, while some of the suggestions of this Committee have merit, CEP in general was appalled by the specious and contradictory arguments and the slippery slope that moves from the possible role of online instruction in certain courses under particular circumstances, to the desirability of online programs. We were particularly disturbed by the way that the Committee construed the intent of Senate Regulations. We remain unconvinced that this is a desirable direction in which to go, much less that the faculty actually want to go there.

The Special Committee has failed to consider the full implications of allowing, even encouraging the elimination of physical residence as a core requirement for a UC undergraduate degree. We believe strongly that it is both counter-intuitive and unproven that the education experience of a student physically present on a UC campus is the same as a UC student earning a degree remotely. Learning material is not to be equated with getting a university degree. The social and well as educational growth of a student are intertwined and facilitated by being physically present on campus for a least a minimum amount of time. Without the student experience of campus life and face-to-face courses, a university degree becomes a commodity driven to the lowest common denominator. We do not believe a UC degree should be so devalued.

Finally we object to being forced to consider this lengthy report on such short notice--and we request that Berkeley's representatives on the Academic Council push back when presented with unrealistic deadlines around the end of a term. Because of the lack of time we cannot engage the full report fully, and will structure our response around the recommendations of the Committee.

1. The first recommendation makes an unwarranted judgment about the potential for online instruction and instructs the Senate to "support faculty and departments interested in the development of remote and online curriculum and programs." While online courses are not without value, nothing in the report warrants support of the development of complete online curriculum and programs, nor is the Committee empowered to instruct the Senate about what to support. We were particularly offended by their adoption of the mantle of academic freedom: "The faculty's authority to develop and implement new approaches to instruction lies within the mandate of academic freedom." Several members of CEP were involved with the adoption of the new Code of Academic Freedom in APM 10, and there is nothing in APM 10 that can be construed as authorizing an individual's development of online courses and curricula. On the contrary, "Academic freedom requires that the Academic Senate be given primary responsibility for applying academic standards, . . . and that the Academic Senate exercise its responsibility in full compliance with applicable standards of professional care."

2. The Committee's call for identical standards of quality in the evaluation of the delivery of instruction and the evaluation of students is well-intentioned. However we question whether online instruction might not require equal but not identical evaluation of students.

3. The third recommendation instructs Divisional committees to develop points to be addressed by faculty requesting approval of new online courses and programs. The Berkeley division, of course, has been a leader in the development of special criteria for online courses. Note, however, the slippery slope in this

recommendation, which suggests that there is an inevitable connection from courses to full-fledged online programs.

4. The fourth recommendation suggests that Divisions require the approval not only of online courses, but of online instructors. This seems a wise recommendation: many online courses may seem of high quality when developed and supported by a faculty member, but the question remains as to who will be the student contact/instructor of record when the faculty member moves on to other interests. There is precedent for the approval of instructors, in the American Cultures requirement and in UC Extension.

5. The fifth recommendation calls for fuller implementation of Senate Regulation 544, which allows students to register for intercampus UC courses and/or for courses offered at another campus. The purpose of SR544 was to facilitate the development of courses at UC centers in Washington and Sacramento, on the model of courses offered by the Education Abroad Program, and to facilitate the fuller exploitation of specialized faculty and other academic resources at one campus by students at another, as in the Southern California Joint Program in Classics between UCR, UCI, and UCSD. SR544 only applies to general credit towards a degree, and articulation of courses for satisfaction of degree and major requirements remains with the campuses and in particular with departments. The existence of articulation agreements with the community colleges points to the feasibility of the former; the long and challenging history of academic integration attempts by EAP points to the difficulty of the latter.

6. For its sixth recommendation, the Special Committee requests special administrative/Senate task forces to explore the benefits and disadvantages of increasing the use of online instruction in the core curriculum of the University. However, there is no such thing as a core curriculum in this University, or even on most campuses. CEP would prefer that any task forces arise organically in response to particular issues and possibilities, since at present there appears to be no great desire on the part of the faculty to develop online courses or undergraduate curricula.

7 and 8. The Committee on the one hand recommends no changes to systemwide policies and regulations, but then proposes a labored reading of SR610, and an amendment to SR610 if such a reading is not upheld! SR610 sets forth the minimum requirements for being matriculated in any given term, subject to the approval of the faculty of a given school or college. SR610 applies to the minimum enrollment for a given term, and should not be confused with the residency requirements imposed by a particular campus (as in the Berkeley Senior Residency requirement, Regulation A291), college, or major.

We urge in the strongest possible terms that SR610 does not allow the interpretation put on it by the Special Committee except in the most disingenuous and historically blind way: any full reading of the regulations regarding residency, all formulated in an era when the only 'remote' learning possible was via correspondence courses, televised courses, and their ilk, unmistakably leads to the conclusion that SR610 means physical residence taking courses approved by the faculty, not just taking courses approved by the faculty.

In conclusion, we do agree that it should be possible for a UC student, physically resident at a campus, to benefit from taking online courses without putting residency at risk. But we think that physical presence on a university campus, as an active part of the intellectual community, is an important part of undergraduate education. Residency, in that specific sense, addresses the student's education outside the classroom via intellectual exchanges, exposure to the wide range of thought on a UC campus, and the basic serendipity of attending a university. How to ensure a successful residential experience in a future world with many online courses is a discussion that the University needs to have. With work, we have learned to benefit from off-site lower division courses (e.g. transfer students), and how to integrate upper division courses taken off-site via UCDC, EAP and similar programs. Those all exist outside the core upper-division experience at the student's home campus, however.

Ignacio Navarrete, chair
Committee on Educational Policy

December 13, 2009

CHAIR CHRISTOPHER KUTZ

Berkeley Division, Academic Senate

Re: COCI Response to REPORT OF SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE ON REMOTE AND ONLINE INSTRUCTION AND RESIDENCY

Dear Chair Kutz,

At its December 4 meeting, COCI discussed the content of the Report and its recommendations. The topic of online education and the emerging body of literature on it is vast and of varying relevance for the University of California and our educational mission. In many instances, this report serves as a good introduction. A number of studies are cited and their probable relevance to UC, if any, is discussed. And in several notable passages (e.g., most of Page 18), the document eloquently frames the questions and concerns that many faculty at UC have regarding online education in meeting the "modern research university's" educational mission, which includes "the stimulation of intellectual curiosity, the nurturing of critical thinking, the inculcation of research skills through the immersion and participation in apprentice/mentor and peer/peer dialogue, and the development of community and global values." The Special Committee then concludes in the next sentence that "the extent to which remote and online instruction can substitute for this traditionally-oriented learning experience is not clear to the Committee" and recommends that online education be pursued with caution and respect for the "traditional learning environment that, in the experience of the Committee, is essential to the University's educational mission." We on COCI concur with these concerns and recommendations expressed here and elsewhere in the report, particularly those regarding the quality of fully online courses and to what extent they can or cannot be appropriately incorporated into a UC education.

However, we also found a number of statements in the report to be inconsistent with the cautious viewpoint above and out of line with current research on the quality versus cost of fully online courses. For example, numerous phrases and statements in the report assert or assume the often popular notion that online instruction can simultaneously improve the quality of instruction, improve access, and reduce costs. Based on available research, we are skeptical of the latter view. Quoting Dr. Diane Harley, Senior Researcher at UC Berkeley's Center for Studies Higher Education:

The potential of information communication technologies is often described as transformational. Reduced cost, increased quality, and wider access are promised—and frequently all three at once. Unfortunately, like the adage about getting something cheap, good, and fast, we are ultimately forced to pick any two. For example, the assumption that costs can be reduced derives from the argument that, by substituting capital (an upfront investment in infrastructure and courseware) for labor costs (faculty time), more students, particularly in large lecture courses, can be served more cheaply.

In particular, it is not clear to COCI how quality can be maintained at lower cost since the majority of us feel that the quality of a course is inextricably linked to student-instructor interactions. It is difficult to see how such interactions will have an efficiency of scale, as implied in portions of this report. They are "people-limited", as is instructor evaluation of course mastery by students, regardless of the technology used for communication. Thus, fully online instruction does not appear to us to be a panacea for current or future decreases in state funding for UC and/or increasing student enrollments. Since quality may also be sacrificed, perhaps less so at the individual course level but almost certainly if a significant fraction of coursework for an undergraduate degree might be replaced with fully online instruction, it seems unwise to move further into fully online courses, to claim they are a solution to current or future budget crises, or to invest heavily in fully online course development before more research is done on currently existing online courses at UC and perhaps on a modest pilot program. Further, such a modest pilot program, as proposed here and as is being explored at UCOP, should be predicated on an open and rigorous academic and financial accounting. A convincing model—one that includes evidence-based evaluations demonstrating that new online approaches appropriate for UC will improve student outcomes and reduce costs—will likely be embraced by faculty. A weak model will invite attacks from some faculty (which in its most extreme may include demanding a moratorium on local approval of any new 100% online courses) and will fail to engage other faculty who might otherwise have been persuaded to contribute to the success of the pilot.

Overall, the premise put forth in various parts of this report that we can improve pedagogy while at the same time reducing costs by putting courses and/or degrees online is a major weakness of the report, and ignores the facts that (1) innovations require considerable investments in capital and time, (2) cost-cutting without innovation leads to decreases in quality, and (3) we seem to be lacking reliable models of the true costs (in time and money) of teaching and learning, especially at UC campuses, and how those might change through technology from which we can then project future outcomes.

COCI also discussed other recommendations in the report:

Recommendations 2 and 3: UC Berkeley's COCI approval process already applies identical standards to courses, online or not (Rec. 2). We have already developed and use a list of supplementary questions (Rec. 3) to be answered and submitted with the course proposal for any online course (which we define to be any course in which more than 33% of traditional student contact time is delivered online). Eleven such courses have been approved and taught at least once since 2002, although 8 (and 5 of the last 5) have been approved for summer session only.

Recommendation 5: COCI will consider in future discussions whether it is appropriate to approve individual instructors for online instruction. We currently follow SR 750, which does not require Senate approval for a variety of instructional titles to teach a class.

Recommendation 6: Further research by a joint Administration/Senate task force on the benefits and disadvantages would be welcome, particularly **before** moving quickly or rapidly to encouraging development of a significant number of fully online courses and before investing the large amount of start-up capital that would be required. Such a task force should focus on online courses that already exist on UC campuses and a comparison with their face-to-face counterparts, through scholarly research studies that have already been done and those that can be initiated by the task force.

Recommendation 8: The report recommends that no change be made to SR610 on residency but only if it is interpreted to mean that any online course given at any UC counts. However, the majority of COCI members argue the opposite: in our opinion, the original intent of this regulation was to ensure that a degree from UC Berkeley (for example) meant that the recipient had been present on campus to participate in the learning processes that occur there and to foster a cohort of scholars, both currently on campus and beyond. Present practice deems that if the Berkeley Division's COCI approves a course as a Berkeley course, it counts for residency, whether it is online or not. However, online engagement (so far) only feebly enables or mimics live discussion with people physically in a given room at a given time, yet this is often the locus of much learning, and it is in any case the kind of learning alumni will use after graduation (in addition to reading on their own) with peers and colleagues in workplaces. This specific activity, not necessarily live lectures or the library, is why it may be essential to incorporate some kind of physical presence on campus in a degree program that has the possibility of taking a significant fraction of courses fully online. Thus, if there is a trend in increasing numbers of online courses, it may make sense to move toward a "face-to-face" definition of residency or physical presence on campus regardless of whether or not online courses are also being taken concurrently.

In addition to responding to the overall recommendations, COCI members also wish to make the following points:

The Report's discussion of UC Berkeley's Chem 1A: The discussion on the "online elements" of the large lower division general chemistry course at UC Berkeley, Chem 1A, cites research and a subsequent report by D. Harley, *et al.*, from 2003, funded in part by the Mellon Foundation.¹ We feel that the discussion of this effort in the Special Committee Report is misleading. This controlled research project compared mainly the cost savings in time and money of adding some technologically-mediated elements to Chem 1A, a course of ~1300 students each fall semester (although some educational outcomes and instructor and student opinions were also part of the study). These "online elements" included conversion from chalkboards to Powerpoint slides, quizzes and pre-lab assignments that were administered and graded online, a course website on which the syllabus and lecture slides were available, an electronic gradebook, availability of webcasts for on-demand replay of live lectures, and the ability to e-mail the instructors. We feel it is important to point out that these "online elements" have been so thoroughly integrated into "traditional" face-to-face courses at UC Berkeley, thanks to considerable investment by the campus since then on efforts such as "bspace" and other technology, that one would be hard-pressed to find anyone who considered these elements to be "online" and not an essential part of a "traditional" class. An important corollary is that many of these time or cost "efficiencies" (e.g., less instructor time spent telling students what is in the syllabus after they lost the paper copy, less time in the laboratory section handing out, collecting, grading, and handing back quizzes), then, are likely to have already been realized, and should therefore not be the basis for assuming that adding more online elements or going fully online would realize any further time or cost efficiencies. **Thus, we recommend that conducting studies similar to this one should be an essential part of researching and documenting the pedagogical and cost outcomes of any courses involved in the recommended pilot venture into online courses.** Finally, it is also important to note that, although the on-demand webcast lectures were available for the "treatment" group of students (and for all students the second year of the study), 80% of the students said they did not want to give up the "live" lectures and never wanted to take a course in which the lectures were webcast only, as documented in the 2002 report.

The Report's discounting of the research university experience for lower division undergraduate students: COCI members disagreed strongly with the sentiment implied in the report that our students learn nothing of value by being at a research university until they enroll in upper division courses (pp. 22-23), and we doubt there is any reliable research to support such an (implied) view. Do we not start teaching "critical thinking" until some unit-value is reached? Does our scholarly research not inform our teaching of freshmen and sophomores, only juniors and seniors? It is difficult to fathom where this viewpoint in the report came from, unless it is the unsupportable assumption that, because lower division courses tend to be large, there is no longer any significant instructor-student or student-student interactions once a class is larger than (*choose a number*); hence they might just as well be taught online. Indeed, this "false dichotomy" was raised in the "Dialectic Paper on Remote/Online Discussion" from 2007, and Berkeley COCI members objected to it in writing then as well.

¹ The Harley et al., 2003 report can be found at http://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/docs/cost_culture_and_complexity.pdf

The importance of defining "access" and some relevant issues regarding online vs traditional courses at UC Berkeley: Whether or not fully online courses will increase access we feel is questionable and, further, arguably depends on how "access" is defined. First, if access is defined as allowing students who cannot live on or near a UC campus due to, e.g., family obligations, then online UC courses may help them. Second, if access is defined as continuing to allow all of the 12.5% of California high school graduates to be enrolled in a UC who wish to do so, then that depends on both state support and believing the premise that online courses will somehow provide an efficiency of scale in that more students can be educated for less money. Again, we are not convinced of that model, as noted above, and believe that the body of evidence so far directly contradicts this notion. Third, if "access" is defined as maintaining access to a UC education for more socioeconomically disadvantaged Californians, then online courses at least as currently imagined may be a poor substitute for traditional face-to-face courses. For example, it is well-established that academically well-prepared students with well-established study skills do well in "correspondence" or "self-paced" courses, in ways somewhat analogous to fully online courses today. Some committee members are concerned that students who are less well-prepared academically will be exactly the students who are most likely to fail fully online courses. Indeed, faculty at UC Berkeley teaching online courses for the first time the past several years were asked to report their findings to COCI comparing their courses offered online during the summer versus the traditional course offered during the academic year. In some cases, they found that a larger percentage of students received D's and F's in the online course than in the traditional course. This difference may be due to it being more difficult to detect which students need intervention from instructors and teaching assistants, lack of help from other students, or lack of local resources such as tutors, student service centers, or advisors on campus. We are concerned that this may disproportionately affect students from less advantaged backgrounds and/or high schools. We are also concerned that an increased failure rate negates the hypothetical cost advantage, since students who fail obviously need to retake the course or take another course.

'Online but Equal'? We question why the Special Committee's report chose to focus on the "fully online" end of the technologically-mediated education continuum rather than the "blended" or "hybrid" end (but then found itself in the difficult position of citing reports which included hybrid courses anyway). We feel it will be more worthwhile to focus on technologies that can be blended into face-to-face courses which, in our opinion, are more likely to improve pedagogy and have some chance of concomitantly increasing some aspects of efficiency, rather than moving to many fully online courses with questionable results regarding one, two, or all three of pedagogy, access, and cost. Further, we think it is relevant and important to question now the scale of intended online offerings should a pilot program for undergraduate programs go forward as recommended here and that is currently being discussed at UCOP and, we presume, by the Gould Commission. Some online presence, either entire courses or "blended" courses, may enhance a UC education. But we doubt that a full degree based on an online set of courses would provide an equivalent educational outcome to that of the traditional face-to-face approach, or to a blend of online and on-site activities within the set of courses leading to individual degrees. We do not believe that fully online courses and degrees at the undergraduate level are inevitable and that a significant amount of undergraduate coursework or even a UC undergraduate degree should be completed online. Rather, we think that fully online courses are

likely to remain an interesting option for UC students, but as a niche of convenience; they will not be money makers, and we think they are unlikely to be money or space savers since ultimately we're limited by people and the cost and bandwidth of people, not space. It is difficult to conceive how an online degree will be equivalent to one in which students were in residence for most of their courses, even if blended with many online activities. Thus, we think that "online but equal" is going to join "separate but equal" as an educational failure.

In light of this, we would like to suggest that the new task force recommended in this report put more effort into thinking creatively about (and how to raise money for) how to "blend" high tech into face-to-face courses in ways that will save money, improve efficiency, and/or increase student learning and satisfaction. We think such an approach will be much more fruitful and yield better outcomes than pursuing "online but equal."

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Kristie A. Boering". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned below the word "Sincerely,".

Kristie A. Boering

Chair, Committee on Courses of Instruction, UC Berkeley

KAB/scq

December 14, 2009

CHRISTOPHER KUTZ, CHAIR

BERKELEY DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

RE: COMP comments on Report of Special Committee on Remote and Online

Instruction and Residency

The full COMP committee has not had time to meet to discuss the report, but several of our members with knowledge in this area have provided comments based on their experience.

Almost all courses already have online components, minimally, for example, bspace for syllabus and assignments, and it is almost inevitable that networks and interfaces will improve dramatically in the future. Online instruction does not mean there is no interaction between

faculty and students. It means that that interaction is mediated by technology, for instance, using video chat, threaded discussion boards, and the like. Accordingly, COMP concurs with the Special Committee's recommendations that seek to provide a framework for the University to take advantage of the opportunities to expand online instruction while ensuring consistency in course curricula and quality of instruction.

Specific responses to various sections in the Report are as follows.

1. A potential major problem with remote instruction is whether the students participating are who they say they are. That comes up in traditional courses, and we have some experience in dealing with it. It is likely to be more serious with online courses, and COMP wonders how it would be handled. There are two points in the report that can be considered implicit references to it: half of point 11 on p.7 is "Assure the integrity of student work ...", and on p.23, 4th arrowhead, "Are the proposed modes of assessment ... unlikely to be compromised by academic dishonesty?" But no reference to experience with the problem, or what can be said about its tractability.

2. On p.11, first new indented item, it is noted that there are *“thousands of recorded lectures for hundreds of unique courses that are available via ‘podcasts.’”* While these archived materials seem to be quite popular, they are generally not used as a primary mode of instruction in Senate-approved courses. Although this may not be an optimal teaching approach, the question of why, if we are going to use recorded lectures, the same recordings can't be used semester after semester should be considered. Some courses deal with material that changes rapidly, but others, such as beginning calculus, or the literature of some past period, do not. If an instructor maintained a set of videotaped lectures, he or she might replace some parts each semester as appropriate similar to revising a book. Aside from developing new homework sets and exams each semester, and grading these, the added value that we give to a course might simply lie in our interaction with students -- responding to questions, prodding them to go a little further with an idea, etc.

3. P.11, second new indented item: This is the only reference in the report of University Extension. Conflicts of "turf" with Extension could arise with respect to remote and online courses. However, there would be opportunities for cooperation between Extension and the regular campuses.

4. P.19, 3rd from last line of middle paragraph: The words *"would be able"* seem to be an editing error

5. P.23, 2nd indented item: Is the rationale for selecting the primary mode of instruction and the primary instructional materials clear and compelling? A valid reason for selecting a nontraditional mode of instruction might simply be to learn more about its advantages and disadvantages.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.



December 9, 2009

PROFESSOR CHRISTOPHER KUTZ:

Chair, Berkeley Division, Academic Senate

*Re: Report of the Senate Special Committee on
Online and Remote Instruction and Residency*

Dear Chair Kutz,

At its December 7, 2009 meeting, the Graduate Council (GC) considered the Report of the Senate Special Committee on Online and Remote Instruction and Residency. Members had no concerns about current procedures for approving individual online courses that might be part of a degree program.. However, there was strong agreement that they do not support academic degrees that are exclusively online and that a key element of any Berkeley degree is participation in a community of scholars on this campus. Members felt that a narrow purpose for online degrees targeted at “professional advancement” degrees might be acceptable. Our reasons for these conclusions follow.

A lot of the discussion about the advantages of online instruction has focused on cost savings, but members are skeptical that online education provides the savings it promises and believe that insufficient attention has been paid to academic quality with respect to overall degree programs. We note that there is some research and considerable anecdotal information about the costs of individual courses. Members were not aware of a financial model that describes known outcomes in individual courses, for example, one that takes into account higher rates of failure by students in online courses, let alone a financial model for a complete degree.

In this respect, audits that the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs will conduct on the two current online graduate degrees at UC (a Master of Science in Engineering at UCLA and a graduate degree program in criminology, law and society at UC Irvine) should yield useful information.

Members thought that residency in an online educational context should mean that students participate in Berkeley’s academic life, although this can be measured differently than it is currently. Members recognize that the existing definition of residency was once a useful tool to

measure the participation of students in the academic community, but that the definition no longer matches its intended purpose. We suggest that the regulation be revised to define residency using measures of active face-to-face participation in a program's activities. We place a high value on a variety of in-person interactions, including structured ones between students and their peers, faculty, participation in professional conferences, and casual interactions as occur in the library and the local coffee shops. Members believe strongly that in-person mentoring and peer interactions are particularly important and cannot be substituted by online mechanisms. For these reasons, members concluded that any degree involving a research and a thesis should be primarily one that involves in person contacts and builds a scholarly community on a campus.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ronald Cohen". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Ronald Cohen

Chair, Graduate Council

RC/lhs



December 12, 2010

TO: BERKELEY DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

FROM: JILL STONER, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON TEACHING 2009 – 2010

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO ONLINE AND REMOTE INSTRUCTION REPORT

A subcommittee of the 2009 – 2010 Committee on Teaching of the Berkeley Academic Senate has reviewed the 'Report of the Senate Special Committee on Online and Remote Instruction and Residency' (hereafter referred to as the 'Report'), and has the following response. The response is framed as a series of concerns, questions and recommendations.

SUMMARY

Many, and perhaps a majority of, faculty now use some form of remote and/or online mechanism as part of their teaching method, including the posting of articles on bSpace, the establishment of online discussion forums for students, and the exchange of materials by email. These methods supplement and enhance the classroom/studio teaching context, rather than substitute for it. This can enrich course content and increase the opportunities for exchange between faculty and students, and among students themselves. This practice will surely increase in the coming years. This subcommittee recommends that the Berkeley campus explore the increasing use of the blended form of online and classroom teaching, but not be motivated or seduced by the promise of cost benefits. Additionally, we recommend that Berkeley not construct entire online degree programs. We recommend instead the formulation of a committee to facilitate the implementation a small number of new online classes, to be carefully formulated and monitored with an emphasis on evaluation of quality of learning experience, and a well-crafted set of metrics by which to measure success. Additionally, we recognize that the online model can more easily accommodate certain kinds of larger lower division classes, particularly those in languages and mathematics.

- *We reject the implementation of online courses as a means to reducing the cost of education.*

The financial incentive for online learning is one of two main arguments for investing in this 'delivery model.' Yet there is no hard evidence that there is a cost benefit, and it is acknowledged that there is a high initial cost to mount these courses. But even if the cost benefit becomes clear, the financial motive leaves unanswered the questions of equal quality, metrics for measuring success, and other 'immeasurable' aspects of the classroom experience. The implementation of instruction as a result of a 'business model' formulation does not privilege the core mission of

university teaching, which is to engage students in the reciprocal nature of learning, to foster intellectual curiosity and critical thinking, and to establish a vibrant community of higher education.

- *The Berkeley campus should make all decisions on the implementation of its online and remote learning.*

Consistent with the recommendations of the Report, we concur that all decisions on the implementation of online instruction should be debated and discussed within the Berkeley campus community, rather than systemwide.

- *We recommend a competitive proposal process for a small number of pilot classes in online learning.*

This requires the establishment of a Committee, or a subcommittee within the Committee on Teaching, to set goals, criteria and budget for the pilot program. This program can potentially begin with three courses: one in the humanities, one in the social sciences, and one in the sciences. The committee can establish metrics for evaluation, issue a request for proposals, evaluate the proposals, and then follow up with an assessment of the success of the course. In this initial phase, the most successful proposals will likely indicate the faculty-member's preparedness for integrating online elements into a syllabus that is rich with qualitative teaching objectives, not just the mastery of subject material.

- *This committee can develop a system of metrics to evaluate the success of an online course.*

As learning is a complex blend of quantitative and qualitative elements, and some of the latter are most evident in the face-to-face engagement of faculty and student in the classroom. In the formulation of online classes, it becomes necessary to formulate a mode of evaluation that takes into account such educational objectives as intellectual curiosity and critical analysis. The formulation of these metrics might also serve to set limits on the kinds of classes that can benefit from online delivery.

- *We reject the concept of online degree programs through the Berkeley campus.*

There are plenty of other places for students to find online degree programs. It is too difficult to manage the admissions process, the curricular material, and the quality of work in such a way to be equal to the Berkeley standards.

Response developed by members of the Committee on Teaching 2009 - 2010

Jill Stoner, Chair

Stephen Welter, Vice Chair

Claire Kramsch

Jon Baio, Student Representative