

COMMITTEE ON COURSES OF INSTRUCTION

Annual Report 2020-21

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI) met bi-weekly throughout the academic year to review campus and systemwide policies, all matters relating to courses of instruction (including review of new courses and revisions to courses), consult with other committees and administrative units, and consider graduate student instructors, undergraduate teaching assistants, student petitions and student grade grievances. For the second year, a smaller cohort of committee members met once during summer 2021, prompted by the April 2, 2021 Call for Online Course Proposals from the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (VPAA) and Online Education (OE) (more on this below under Course Approvals).

The 2020-21 year continued to be out of the ordinary for CCI, as a multitude of new issues arose due to the COVID-19 pandemic. CCI reviewed an increasing number of online courses this year. There was an increase in Disciplinary Communication (DC) substitution requests, as students' original plan for satisfying DC requirements were derailed by COVID-19. Student petitions sometimes cited challenges related to COVID-19 such as impacts to student's health or the health of family members and relocation. CCI provided a secure DocuSign link for students to attach medical documentation. With the steady increase of workload for the committee, the bi-weekly meeting teams were extended from 1 hour and 15 minutes to 2 hours.

I. Course Approvals

Between September 30, 2020 and July 1, 2021 the committee reviewed 314 course approvals. Of those, 181 were proposals for new courses, and 133 were course revision proposals.

Throughout the course approval process, CCI routinely requested that instructors update course syllabi in accordance with the list of syllabus requirements noted on the course approval forms in the Curriculum Management System (CAT) to promote the inclusion of important elements in each course syllabi. On January 8, 2021 CCI distributed a *Committee on Courses of Instruction Syllabus Requirements Checklist for Internal Department and Program Use*.¹ CCI encouraged faculty to add or clarify aspects of their syllabi, particularly:

- Breakdown of Student Hours. The purpose of this is to allow students to develop a time management plan for their studies—for example, this would enable students who read relatively slowly to know that a course may be extra demanding for them.
- Closed Week Policy Reminder. No examinations, tests, assignments, papers, final projects or final performances that result in more than 12.5% of the final grade (other than individual make-up exams) may be given during the last week of instruction. This restriction does not apply to summer, which does not have a closed week.

¹ <https://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cep-committee-on-educational-policy/policies-guidelines/cci-syllabus-requirement-revised-december-20201.pdf>

- Policies on collaborations, citation, and academic integrity should be course-specific. CCI noted that clarification regarding academic integrity policies are especially important in courses where collaborative work and outside resources are used.

II. Summer 2021 Review of Online Course Proposals

In light of the remote teaching and learning challenges presented by the COVID-19 pandemic, VPAA Herbie Lee and Online Education issued a call for online course proposals for fall 2021: *“The campus seeks proposals from faculty to develop on a voluntary basis asynchronous online and hybrid courses to be offered in fall 2021 to ensure instructional capacity and quality as we transition back to in-person instruction.”* Due to the additional time needed to create these classes, a smaller cohort of CCI met over summer to review asynchronous online courses with enrollment of 150 students or more for fall 2021.

OE selected seven instructors to work with on asynchronous courses over the summer. Of these, two courses had not been previously approved, and required CCI review. Eighteen instructors submitted hybrid course proposals that did not require CCI review under the fall 2021 delegation of authority. Courses were developed in cohorts of roughly ten faculty led by an instructional designer, supporting staff, and a faculty fellow. Each cohort worked together for six weeks. Late course development and review is not routine practice and was done solely in response to ongoing COVID-related challenges. CCI members who chose to serve over the summer were asked to track their time spent in CCI meetings and doing committee work, and will be compensated for their time at the end of the summer.

III. UNEX Course-Approval Process

Regulations of the Academic Senate require that all University Extension (UNEX) courses whose course numbers are prefixed with X or XSC be approved by the appropriate department on the UCSC main campus and, in certain cases (detailed below), by the Committee on Courses of Instruction. In 2020, CCI Chair and an UNEX Analyst agreed on the following course approval process:

1. All proposed UNEX courses will be stored and reviewed in a "UNEX Course Approval" folder, located in a folder shared by CCI and UNEX.
2. UNEX contacts the CCI analyst at cci@ucsc.edu with a brief description of the course, the proposed course number, and name. The exact course number may change, but the category—whether it is a XSC 1–299 or X 1-299 or X300–499—will not change. Courses in other categories do not need main-campus approval. However, courses in the XCal or X categories will need approval from other agencies of the Academic Senate.
3. CCI informs UNEX of the appropriate department to contact and the contact information of the department chair.
4. UNEX contacts the department chair, who may assign the task of reviewing the course to a faculty member in their department, in which case, the department chair will inform UNEX contacts of the faculty member’s full name and email address. UNEX will then contact the faculty member, and provide a link via the Google Shared Drive Folder to the documents in need of review. Each new proposed course will have its own sub-folder and “Chair Review Items” document provided by UNEX. The department chair or designated faculty member will complete the “Chair Review Items” document during the review of each course.

5. The department reviews and (possibly with changes) approves the course. It is generally expected that this will happen within 3 weeks.
 - a. The standard of review for X300–499 courses is whether they are at a level that is suitable to be offered by UC Extension as part of a UNEX certificate program.
 - b. The standard of review for X1–299 courses is whether they are at a level that they could be UCSC main-campus courses. (1–99 at a lower division level, 100–199 at an upper division level, and 200–299 at a graduate level.)
 - c. The standard of review of XSC1–299 courses is whether they are strictly equivalent to a corresponding UCSC main campus course.
6. Approval from the department is communicated by UNEX to CCI, along with the packet that was sent for approval. Both CCI and UNEX will maintain records of courses approved.
7. If the course is a X300–499 course, it can now be advertised and taught. If the course is a X1–299 or XSC1–299 course, it has to now be approved by CCI before it can be advertised and taught.

CCI also asked that UNEX provide faculty with an acknowledgement letter of the work performed for their personnel files. 14 UNEX courses were reviewed.

IV. COVID-19: Remote Course Delegations of Authority

On September 30, 2020, Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), CCI, and Graduate Council (GC) jointly announced with the CP/EVC that winter quarter 2021 instruction would be largely online with the Senate delegating authority for approval of remote offering of courses to course-sponsoring agencies.

On November 2, 2020, the CP/EVC announced with CEP, CCI, and GC that spring and summer quarters would be remote with the delegation of approval for offering of courses to course-sponsoring agencies.

On February 25, 2021, CEP, CCI and GC announced jointly with the CP/EVC that fall 2021 instruction will include a mix of remote, online, and in-person instruction. The Senate delegated authority for approval of remote course offerings for fall 2021. On March 23, 2021, CP/EVC announced that instruction would largely aim to be in-person. The delegation to course-sponsoring agencies remained.

V. Revised Online-Course Policy

A subcommittee including the CCI chair, a CCI faculty member representative, the CEP chair, a CEP faculty member representative, the Director for Online Education, and the Associate Registrar was formed in winter 2021 to review and propose revisions for the online-course policy. The policy revisions were motivated by the need to resolve that the current Undergraduate Online Course Policy only applied online to asynchronous online courses. With the expanded use of synchronous courses brought on by the pandemic, and an expectation that some faculty will want to continue to teach in a synchronous online format, CEP and CCI felt the urgency to provide an approval pathway that allows CCI to evaluate the effectiveness of these courses in the approval process. Other changes are detailed below. After stakeholder review, the new policy and approval

pathways were extended to graduate courses as well. GC also approved the revised policy for graduate courses.

Key changes to the existing policy and course approval pathways:

- A workflow that deals with more than purely asynchronous courses (synchronous and hybrid courses have become increasingly common and they are not currently reviewed by CCI);
- Approval pathway for synchronous online courses;
- Approval pathway for hybrid courses;
- A system of reporting and oversight that requires renewal for asynchronous online courses every three years instead of an exhaustive departmental report.

VI. Student Petitions and Grievances

Between September 30, 2020 and July 9, 2021, the committee made decisions on 309 student petitions. Of these 258 (83.50 %) were approved and 51 (16.50 %) were denied. The largest number of petitions reviewed were for substitutions of General Education requirements (64, 20.71%), followed by withdrawal grade requests (63, 20.39%), late add/drop requests (61, 19.74%), grade option change: graded to pass/no pass requests (58, 18.77%), DC substitutions (16, 5.18%), Catalog year change requests (16, 5.18%), Grade option changes: Pass/No Pass to Graded (11, 3.56%), Waivers of Senior Residency requirements (9, 2.91%), Grade Change requests (5, 1.62%), writing requirement extensions (5, 1.62%), and a Transfer/Duplicate Credit Exception (1, 0.32%).

Student Petitions

CCI elected to revise the GE Substitution Form, asking that students themselves respond to the questions related to the GE substitution request, which can be found in the General Education Requirements Table. This differs from prior practice in which the instructor responded to the questions. A copy of an email exchange or a letter signed by the instructor confirming the accuracy of the student's statements and explaining why the reason the substitution is valid, is now sufficient for this requirement.

Grade Grievances

The committee reviewed 7 grade grievances: 4 were denied, 2 were approved, and one was withdrawn. CCI noted most grade grievances are related to academic integrity issues. Proactively, VPDUE Richard Hughey asked CCI to comment on proposed changes to the Academic Integrity Process. CCI and CEP sent a joint response. CCI also observed many COVID-related petitions regarding issues such as illness, relocating, and remote-learning interruptions.

VII. Launch of CARS System to Review Petitions

Throughout 2020-21, CCI in collaboration with Information Technology Systems (ITS) created a new workflow system titled CARS (Community Application and Review System), which was launched in summer 2020 to review student grade grievances, student petitions, Graduate Student Instructor (GSI) requests, and Undergraduate Teaching Assistants requests. Email notifications of CCI's decisions were sent on the Tuesday following each CCI meeting. The notifications were sent to the student, college advisors, CCI Chair, CCI Analyst, and the Registrar. CCI decisions were logged by petition type on the CCI Student Petition Decision Log and shared with the

Registrar Advising Systems Team, Registrar ERT, Academic Preceptors, and the UCSC Summer Session Office. This log and the notification emails served as a useful communication tool for CCI and others to process updates to student records. CCI was made aware of occasional technical issues regarding CARS access and temporary glitches that were resolved with the help of ITS Product Suite Manager Leslie Geary and ITS Programmer Analyst Jim Snook. CCI is grateful for their help. The CARS system allows the requestor to view the decision status immediately, which does prompt some requesters to inquire about processing before email notifications can be generated. CCI received helpful feedback regarding the CARS system and petition forms and is continuing to make updates to simplify and clarify where possible.

In the summer of 2020, ITS advised CCI on a revision to the petition workflow for students to provide highly confidential medical documentation through a secure DocuSign link embedded in the CARS petition form.

VIII. Teaching Appointments

Between September 30, 2020 and July 9, 2021, the committee considered 284 requests for Graduate Student Instructor (GSI) teaching appointments and 26 for Undergraduate Teaching Assistant (UTA) appointments.

IX. Changes to Criteria for GSI Appointments

In the spring of 2020, CCI sent communication to course-sponsoring agencies regarding changing the criteria for GSI appointments. This was instigated by concern that in recent years GSI appointments were transitioning from being strictly a learning experience, to one that was subject to the competing interests of balancing the University's budget, and/or increasing graduate student growth. The committee found that quality control expected from the faculty mentoring system is not always reliable. To maintain the quality of the GSI experience, CCI proposed additional criteria listed in the 2019-20 CCI Annual Report².

In the responses received by CCI's initial communication, questions were raised about jurisdiction. Several responses cited Santa Cruz Division Bylaw SCB 13.17.4 of the Academic Senate, which states that GSI appointment criteria (for undergraduate courses) are set by CEP and implemented by CCI. In response to jurisdiction and in accordance with SCB 13.17.4, the primary responsibility for GSI Criteria Proposal was transferred to CEP, with consultation and collaboration with CCI.

In December 2020, CEP and CCI sent communication to course-sponsoring agencies regarding the changes to GSI appointment criteria within the context of Summer Session for it to be effective for summer sessions 2021. The committees made the following rules:

- Courses taught by GSIs during summer sessions do not count toward the maximum 25% of GSI-taught courses for a department.
- While summer GSIs must be adequately supervised at the same level as expected for normal quarters, it will be left to the proposing departments to explain how GSIs will be supervised as part of their request to appoint a GSI.

² CCI to Departments re Proposed Changes to GSI Appointment Criteria, 5/28/2020

- Some departments may have to compensate summer supervisors in some way, but it will be up to the department how they handle this. Departments should provide this information regarding supervision in their requests to CCI.

At the beginning of the 2021 winter quarter, CEP and CCI distributed the Finalized GSI Appointment Criteria for Undergraduate Courses to department chairs, program directors, and college provosts. The committees recognize that there is significant variation across campus regarding both departmental use of GSIs for instruction, and with regards to perceptions about the appropriateness of GSI instruction, hence, the necessity and importance for CEP to provide clarification and guidance in moving forward. The following are the criteria:

1. GSI applications must explain how GSIs are properly prepared to teach their course. GSIs who have completed departmental or CITL training will be at a competitive advantage³.
2. a. GSIs for courses that require teaching assistants must have advanced to candidacy and must have served as a course instructor before.
b. Enrollment in a GSI-taught course is limited to 120.
3. GSIs must not have academic integrity actions from the university on their record.
4. A faculty mentor may not oversee more than two GSIs in a term unless the mentor is compensated or the service is otherwise recognized.
5. A mentor must have taught the course in question or one in a related area in the last three years. This is to ensure that the mentor is familiar with how the course should be taught. Otherwise, they must be actively committed to co-developing the curricular plan, and state this commitment and planned mentoring activities in a letter to CCI.

Additionally, CEP affirms that no more than 25% of the 5-credit upper division courses offered by a course-sponsoring agency over two consecutive academic years can be taught by GSIs. These finalized changes to the GSI appointment criteria will be applicable beginning in fall 2021. Departments still have the ability to petition to CCI for exceptions to these criteria.

These criteria have been posted on CCI's website.

³ From CEP's August 2020 Correspondence: Based on guidance from campus administrators, at least one of the options available to students has to be a credit-bearing pedagogy course, or else the training is considered part of the GSI workload. Keeping in mind that departments are busy with remote instruction at present, we are proposing that the effective date for this requirement be Fall 2022.

Departments have broad discretion about how their pedagogy courses are designed, but we are requesting departments to report to CCI by Spring 2022 about how they plan to satisfy this criterion. A single course can be used to train both GSIs and teaching assistants.

X. Changes to Faculty Mentor Agreement

The Committee on Courses of Instruction Faculty Oversight and Mentoring Agreement was revised on August 27, 2020, and a reminder was sent to departments on October 8, 2020.

In response to feedback from departments, CCI made the following changes and issued a revised Committee on Courses of Instruction Faculty Oversight and Mentoring Agreement for Undergraduate Courses December 2020. CCI made several changes to provide more flexibility for Faculty Mentors on the timing of interactions with GSIs. CCI also noted that faculty mentors should be assigned no more than 2 GSIs, unless the faculty member is compensated or service is recognized. The changes are listed below:

Item #4.

Replaced: “Conduct one class visit and follow-up meeting with the GSI within the first three weeks of the teaching quarter.”

With:

Conduct one class visit and follow-up meeting with the GSI within the first third of the teaching quarter.

Item #5

Replaced: “Meet again with the GSI and with the TA(s) (if any) between weeks 5 and 10 to discuss how the course is going. Be available to discuss matters related to the course throughout the quarter.”

With:

Meet again with the GSI and with the TA(s) (if any) in the second half of the quarter to discuss how the course is going. Be available to discuss matters related to the course throughout the quarter.

Item #7

Added: CCI recommends that these evaluations should be kept internally within the division and/or department.

Added: a footnote regarding Mentor/GSI ratio of greater than 1:2, faculty should be compensated or service recognized for additional GSIs. This is currently a best-practice recommendation and will fully go into effect in fall 2021. For Summer Session, this policy is modified to allow for the chair to oversee or appoint and compensate a faculty member to oversee.

GC will still be reviewing GSI appointments for graduate courses⁴.

XI. Closed-Week Policy

In collaboration and consultation with CEP, revisions were made to CEP’s policy on Final Assessments. This was done for better clarity when CCI reviews syllabus requirements. The

⁴https://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/gc-graduate-council/gc_gsi_requestform_gradcourses_final20.fillable_aug2020-2.pdf

“Closed Week” section now states⁵:

The purpose of closed week (for fall, winter, and spring quarters only) is two-fold: (1) to ensure that the full 11 weeks of the quarter are used for instruction (10 weeks) and assessment (1 week of finals) and (2) to provide students time to complete coursework and prepare for their final assessments.

To meet these goals, no examinations, tests, assignments, papers, final projects, presentations, or final performances that result in more than 12.5% of the final grade (other than individual makeup exams) may be due during the last week of instruction. Portfolios or collections of previously assessed work may be collected during the closed week, as long as any newly assessed work does not account for more than 12.5% of the final grade.

Take-home exams or short projects assigned in the last week of instruction and due during finals week should equate roughly to the amount of work required in a traditional three-hour exam time slot. (The three-hour limit for completion of a take-home exam or short project does not include the time required for studying or preparing to complete the assignment.) Larger projects or assignments that students have had several weeks to work on may be due during finals week.

For courses that have a final performance as a main assessment of the course, especially where scheduling students’ performances entirely during finals week is infeasible, presentations may be spread over the final weeks of the quarter including the use of the final exam time slot during week 11. If this is done, instructors should both make clear that students should be preparing for these performances weeks ahead of time and provide complete assignment instructions for how to do so well in advance.

Assignments and exams due during finals week should not be due earlier than the [exam slot scheduled⁶](#) for the course by the Office of the Registrar (this includes Non Standard Times 1 and 2 for courses outside of standard time blocks).

XII. Student Union Assembly Voter Registration

The Student Union Assembly (SUA) contacted CCI to request consideration of adding voter registration information as a syllabus requirement. CCI declined the proposals due to insufficient time for changes to be implemented or appropriately reviewed. However, CCI noted that many faculty have made efforts to distribute voter registration information in various ways. Additionally, the Academic Senate sent out two messages to faculty in fall 2020 regarding the important and timely issue of voting and encouraging students to register.

XIII. Consultation with Articulations Officer Thompson

⁵<https://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cep-committee-on-educational-policy/policies-guidelines/final-examinations-policy-revised-021721.pdf>

⁶<https://registrar.ucsc.edu/soc/final-examinations.html#c>

CCI consulted with Articulation Officer Molly Thompson on April 12, 2021. CCI determined that ultimately SCR 10.2.3.2 supersedes CEP's December 6, 2018 correspondence⁷ withdrawing admissions authority to review GE articulations. CCI provided Undergraduate Admissions with a list of recent GE substitution approvals from other institutions. CEP and CCI reviewed the "GE Guidelines" currently used by Undergraduate Admissions (UA) and confirmed it is consistent with the GE Requirements Table. In the future CCI will be available to assist in making GE determinations should the UA require assistance.

XIV. Consultation with Global Engagement

On February 8, 2021, CCI consulted with Jeremy Keith Hourigan, Faculty Director of the Division of Global Engagement. Director Hourigan advised that Global Classroom is a collaborative online international learning (COIL) strategy. It does not require mobility, and benefits students that cannot travel abroad. Global Classroom Courses are existing UCSC classes with an additional collaborative project that is designed for UCSC students and students in a foreign institution to work together on. CCI provided information regarding syllabus requirements and logistics regarding course equivalency.

On June 18, 2021, CCI clarified the following regarding Global Classroom Courses:

CCI has the following guidance for courses which implement a collaborative component with an outside institution:

1. If the academic content of a Global Classroom course is equivalent to the existing course, then CCI does not need to review the revised course.
2. If the Global Classroom course requires adding/changing the general education designation to the existing course, then it should be a new course and must be reviewed by CCI.
3. Finally, if the Global Classroom course is a hybrid course that will not have at least 50% of the standard contact hours in person, or exams are administered remotely, then CCI review is required.

XV. Subcommittees

Each year, CCI is asked for representatives to serve on the following external committees as relevant to the committee purview.

- Online Taskforce (Patrick Chung and Yat Li)
- Charter group for Online Programs Campus Initiative (Kevin Karplus)
- Online Programs Initiative Mechanics and Practicum subcommittee (Yat Li)

XVI. Undergraduate Student Representatives

Representatives from the Student Union Assembly participated on CCI in the fall and partially during winter quarter. CCI and the Committee on Committees (COC) discussed whether or not it was appropriate for student representatives to have access to and review student petitions and grievances due to the confidential aspects of these files. COC determined that the ongoing precedent of students not participating in the review of student petitions should continue for 2020–

⁷ CEP to Undergraduate Admissions Director re GE Designations for Courses Taken Elsewhere; December 6, 2018

21, not all CCI members supported this decision. As a result of the decision, the student representatives resigned from the committee. COC will be discussing this further in the 2021–22 academic year.

XVII. Correspondence

Systemwide:

- Systemwide Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 544; October 29, 2020
- Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 630; October 29, 2020
- Online Undergraduate Degree Task Force Report; November 19, 2020

Other:

- Committee on Courses of Instruction Faculty Oversight and Mentoring Agreement; August 27, 2020
- CEP, CCI, GC to VPDUE RE: Request for Delegation of Remote Instruction Authority; September 16, 2020
- CCI to Dept Chairs RE: CCI's New Faculty Mentor Agreement; October 8, 2020
- CCI to SUA RE: CCI Action Request Response: Voter Registration Information Distribution; October 29, 2020
- CCI to VPDUE Delegation of Instruction to Course Sponsoring Agencies for Summer 2021; November 2, 2020
- CCI to ASC Re Disability Resource Center; December 16, 2020
- CCI to Dept Chairs, Program Directors, Dept Managers re CCI Undergraduate and Graduate Syllabi Requirement Checklist; January 8, 2021
- Committee on Courses of Instruction Syllabus Requirements Checklist for Internal Department and Program Use; January 2021
- CEP and CCI to CPB re Classroom Space Issues; January 8, 2021
- CCI to COT, CAF, and CEP re Consideration of a Syllabi Database; February 5, 2021
- CCI to Course Sponsoring Agencies re Fall 2021 Course Deadline Reminder; March 8, 2021
- CCI to CRES re CRES GSI Exception Request for 2021-22; May 11, 2021
- CCI to Undergraduate Admissions re General Education (GE) Articulations and Delegation of Authority; May 21, 2021
- CCI to MCD Bio re GE Requirements; May 28, 2021
- CCI to Literature re GSI Guidelines Waiver of Mentor GSI Ratio; June 4, 2021

XVIII. Recommendations for 2021–22 CCI

- Annual Fall Correspondence regarding course and GSI deadlines.
- Continue to support changes to the Student Academic Conduct Policy.
- Consider having faculty commit to a 3-year term on CCI, because continuity in membership will better ensure policy decision uniformity over time. Terms should be staggered so that only a third of the committee is new each year. A succession plan, such as one year as Vice Chair before serving as Chair, would also be valuable.
- Discuss adding a new requirement for syllabi: contingency planning for campus disruptions. With fires likely to be frequent in fall quarters and campus-wide strikes also quite likely any quarter, every faculty member should be thinking about how their course

will continue in the face of disruption. CCI needs to decide whether to require contingency plans in the syllabi and, if required, what standards to apply to evaluating them.

- Train new members on accessing records of previous decisions, so they can use this information to guide and regularize future decisions on student petitions. Consider documenting discussions and generating a best-practices document.
- Allow the committee flexibility to make decisions quarter-by-quarter due to the very unusual circumstances around remote instruction.

The committee would like to especially thank Rebecca Hurdis and Morgan Gardea for serving as the analysts during this academic year. Their efforts and work in supporting the committee were invaluable in ensuring the efficacy of the committee. Additionally, the committee also wants to thank Deputy Registrar Margie Claxton for her consultation and guidance since the inception of CCI. We wish her well in her retirement.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON COURSES OF INSTRUCTION

Elizabeth Beaumont (F)

Patrick Chuang

Carolyn Dean (F,W)

Kevin Karplus

Rebecca London (S)

Amanda Rysling

Eve Zyzik (S)

Yat Li, Chair

Kalin McGraw, Associate Registrar, *ex officio*

Margie Claxton, Deputy Registrar, Standing guest

Marie Yoo, Academic Preceptor, Standing guest

Daniel Halpern-Devries, Undergraduate Student Rep

Natasha Matti, Undergraduate Student Rep

August 31, 2021

Appendix I.

Committee on Courses of Instruction Syllabus Requirements Checklist for Internal Department and Program Use

*** CCI is providing this checklist to departments as a way to help the new course and revised course proposals that come to the committee. Ideally, this checklist should be given to instructor to use to review their syllabus before having the department/program staff submit it in the CAT system. These requirements listed are what the committee uses to evaluate a new or revised course.*

If the uploaded syllabus is missing one or more of the elements below, course approval will be delayed until a completed syllabus is submitted. For best practices, please refer to [CITL](#), [IRAPS Course Learning Outcomes](#); and [Programming Outcomes by Division](#), and [DRC](#), particularly for learning outcomes, course pacing and grading structures.

Undergraduate Courses

1. Learning outcomes or objectives specific to the course (it is recommended that at least one align with your program's learning outcomes)
2. Nature of assignments/assessments (projects, homework, written assignments, quizzes, exams, etc.) and how these connect to the course learning objectives
3. Weekly schedule for course materials
4. Student hours for class: Systemwide Senate Regulation 760 specifies that one academic credit corresponds to a total of 30 hours of work for the median student over a quarter (e.g., 3 hours per week for a 10-week quarter). Syllabus should estimate the anticipated distribution of the required hours. For example, a 5-unit course may require 3.25 hours of lecture, 5 hours of reading, 1 hour of section, and 5.75 hours of homework per week.
5. How assessments add up to a final grade
6. If you are not giving a final exam in the course's assigned time slot, provide information regarding what replacement for a final exam will be used.
7. No examinations, tests, assignments, papers, final projects or final performances that result in more than [12.5% of the final grade](#) (other than individual makeup exams) may be given during the last week

of instruction. This does not include the collection of materials produced throughout the quarter, such as final portfolios.

8. Policies on collaboration, citation, and academic integrity specific to the course. Please refer to [CITL's Sample Syllabus Language document](#) and/or the [UE's Faculty Resources page](#).
9. The following notification for student support resources is required: [DRC](#)
10. The following notifications for student support resources are recommended: CARE, Title IX, CAPS. Please refer to [CITL's Syllabus Template](#) resource page.

Graduate Courses

1. Course learning outcomes or objectives (it is recommended that at least one align with your program's learning outcomes)
2. Nature of assignments and how they connect to course goals
3. Weekly schedule for course materials
4. Method of determining final grade, including the weight for each element, if providing letter grades
5. Policies on collaboration, citation, and academic integrity with links to resources on correct practice
6. The following notification for student support resources is required: [DRC](#)
7. The following notifications for student support resources are recommended: [CARE](#), [Title IX](#), [CAPS](#).

Appendix II. Revised Online Course Policy

Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and Graduate Council (GC)

Policy on UC Santa Cruz Undergraduate and Graduate Online and Hybrid Courses

Introduction

Online instruction is increasingly being integrated into the national educational experience. Many instructors at UC Santa Cruz have already developed innovative ways of using technologies in online courses that provide high-quality learning experiences. As with any new approach to teaching at UC Santa Cruz, it is important to monitor the quality of the educational experience being offered. This oversight is the remit of the Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI) for individual courses, Committees on Educational Policy (CEP), and Graduate Council (GC) for overall policy.

Departments and other course sponsoring agencies (CSA's) should consider where and how they think online courses are best used in their curricula. Departments and programs that have already had such conversations and developed policies around them will be well-placed to help individual instructors develop successful proposals for online courses with minimal additional steps. CEP and GC will work with departments that have not already developed such policies in doing so.

At UC Santa Cruz, faculty have developed online courses in asynchronous and synchronous formats^[1]. Faculty have also begun to develop hybrid courses. For the purposes of this policy, these course formats are defined as follows:

Asynchronous Online: Instruction that is characterized by its reliance on lectures, engagement activities, assessments, or other course materials that are pre-recorded and carefully pre-planned for students who will have minimal (or no) face-to-face^[2], real-time interactions. Asynchronous courses do not have set meeting times that are advertised to students when they enroll; instead, students typically access the materials at a time of their choosing within the timeframe specified by the instructor (e.g., all of week three materials might be available on the first day of week three).

Synchronous Online: Instruction that is characterized by its use of videoconferencing software to facilitate face-to-face, real-time interaction with students. Similar to courses taught in person, synchronous online courses are also characterized by their use of set meeting times that are advertised to students when they enroll.

Hybrid: Instruction that includes multiple modalities in one course. These modalities are most commonly asynchronous and in-person, but may also be synchronous and in-person, or asynchronous and synchronous.

Asynchronous, synchronous, and hybrid courses represent distinct approaches to teaching and learning given their reliance on educational technologies. All UC Santa Cruz courses are expected to meet the same high standards, and common characteristics of high-quality courses (regardless of modality) includes active engagement of a qualified instructor who has significant expertise in the subject of the course; regular and pedagogically significant interactions between instructor and students; and a means for students to regularly assess their progress towards achievement of course learning outcomes. All courses are expected to provide appropriate accommodations for students with accommodations approved by the Disability Resource Center (drc@ucsc.edu). Designing new hybrid or online courses presents a unique opportunity to develop courses that are highly accessible.

A successful online course presents educational experiences that differ from those associated with in-person courses, but provides students with an equivalent educational outcome to that of an in-person class. This equivalency should therefore apply to other aspects of educational policy. This guiding principle is relevant to the credit that students receive for taking the class and means that the approval pathway for an online class should (after the initial monitoring period) be the same as an in-person class.

CEP, GC, and CCI wish to encourage, not discourage, the creative use of technologies in online courses with the aim of improving student learning. If you are new to teaching in an online format, or looking for additional guidance, you are encouraged to reach out to Online Education (online@ucsc.edu). Supplemental information from instructors of online courses is requested in order to study the crucial aspects of a successful online offering; given the different online offering formats (asynchronous and synchronous), the supplemental sheets differ slightly to focus on the most pertinent information. For hybrid courses, in most cases only a brief supplemental checklist will be required. In some cases, such as when remote exams are being used in a hybrid course, CCI requires the instructor to provide additional information.

Asynchronous and Synchronous Online Course Approval Pathway

The course approval process is as follows:

1. Instructors first consult their department's policy about online courses in their curriculum, if one exists, and develop a course consistent with it.
2. Instructors work to obtain approval from their department for their course proposal.
3. Instructors may then contact the Office of Online Education (online@ucsc.edu) for consultation regarding development or support.
4. Instructors must then apply for approval from CCI, which requires an online supplemental form.
5. *Asynchronous courses only*: After three years, the department must submit a renewal request for the course to continue to be offered asynchronously.^[3] Permanent approval can be requested after the first successful renewal cycle.

Hybrid Course Approval Pathway

The course approval process is as follows:

1. Instructors first consult their department's policy about hybrid courses in their curriculum, if one exists, and develop a course consistent with it.
2. Instructors work to obtain approval from their department for their course proposal.
3. Instructors may then contact the Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning (citl@ucsc.edu) or Online Education (online@ucsc.edu) for consultation regarding development or support.
4. Instructors must then request approval from CCI; in most cases this will only require a supplemental checklist.

A. POLICIES FOR APPROVAL OF ONLINE COURSES

1. Asynchronous online courses will be approved for up to three years after the initial offering of the course. Renewal will be based on CCI's assessment of a request for renewal.^[4] Permanent approval can be requested after the first successful renewal cycle.
2. Required courses for undergraduate majors and minors, as well as graduate degrees, cannot be offered exclusively in an asynchronous online format. Required courses must be taught in-person at least once during any academic year in which they are offered. Exceptions to this policy can be requested and may be approved by CCI, and must be based on clear pedagogical advantages or on student demand.
3. All online and hybrid courses must be clearly identified in the schedule of classes. Courses will also be included in the course catalog.
4. All campus policies and regulations for courses and instruction (registration deadlines, academic integrity, grading, instructor availability, etc.) that apply to non-online courses also apply to fully

online courses. Classes must conform to the standard 10-week (academic year) and Summer session schedules.

B. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FOR ONLINE COURSE PROPOSALS

The supplemental questions are available on CEP, GC and CCI's websites and/or available in the CAT system.

Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy on November 14, 2018, and revised on May 12, 2021.

^[1] "Remote" instruction, as characterized by the primary modality of instruction used during the COVID-19 pandemic, is a modality that CEP and GC have reserved for use during emergencies when it is unfeasible for departments to request CCI approval for online or hybrid versions of courses.

^[2] A face-to-face contact hour is defined as a lecture or discussion session taught by the primary instructor that a student can attend in a setting where the instructor is physically present, even if the session is simultaneously presented online. The determination of pedagogically significant face-to-face contact hours does not include office hours, time spent in exams proctored in person, or contact hours with secondary instructors, such as Teaching Assistants.

^[3] In cases where there are multiple versions offered of the same approved course (for instance, WRIT-2), the department should address whether the versions will all continue to be offered. The department should also request voluntary feedback for the renewal request from the instructors who have taught the online versions.

^[4] Grant-supported online courses such as those funded by Innovative Learning and Technology Initiative (ILTI) are subject to this approval process, but can fulfill their initial offering commitment regardless of the outcome of the three-year request for renewal.

Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), Graduate Council (GC) & Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI)

Asynchronous Online Supplemental Questions & Checklist

Asynchronous: Instruction that is characterized by its reliance on lectures, engagement activities, assessments, or other course materials that are pre-recorded and carefully pre-planned for students who will have minimal (or no) face-to-face, real-time interactions. Asynchronous courses do not have set meeting times that are advertised to students when they enroll; instead, students typically access the materials at a time of their choosing within the timeframe specified by the instructor (e.g., all of week three materials might be available on the first day of week three).

Open-ended Questions

1. Explain why this course is appropriate in an asynchronous online format. If there are student learning outcomes that may be addressed through the offering format, explain them here.
2. Discuss the placement of the course in the department or program's curriculum and whether it is an undergraduate major, undergraduate minor, or graduate degree requirement (note that required courses must be offered in a non-asynchronous format at least once during any year that they are offered). If the course has an in-person counterpart, please discuss how the two versions would be scheduled in relation to each other, their expected enrollment levels, or any key differences between the two versions.
3. Describe the methods or approaches used to facilitate interaction between students to develop a sense of community. This is especially important in asynchronous courses because of the reduced reliance on face-to-face interactions. Examples include using and actively participating in discussion forums (text, video or audio); designing assignments that require peer-to-peer interaction; and creating a climate that is welcoming to all students. More examples of best practices related to inclusion and equity are [available](#).
4. Describe instructor presence in a typical week for the course. Explain how the instructor engages with students through pre-recorded video(s), in discussion forums or through written feedback on submitted work, during office hours or other face-to-face interactions, feedback on students' assignments, or through other means.
5. For courses supported with Teaching Assistants, describe how Teaching Assistants engage with students through discussion forums, secondary discussion sections, feedback on submitted work, or through other means. If the course is not supported with Teaching Assistants, reply with "not applicable".

6. Describe the resources and structure provided to students to help them navigate, make progress, and succeed in this asynchronous course. Examples include: using an introduction module; adopting a modular course structure; hosting a synchronous meeting to orient students to the course early in the quarter and recording it for students who cannot attend; holding office hours at different times of the day to better accommodate students in different time zones; including time estimates for activities and assignments.
7. Explain how exams, such as midterms and finals, are administered and explain what steps are taken to maintain academic integrity. If the course uses remote proctoring for exams, information regarding the method for remote proctoring (i.e., ProctorU or Zoom-based proctoring) must be included on the syllabus. Instructors are encouraged to provide an in-person option for students to take exams on the UCSC campus whenever possible.

Check-box Statements (required)

- UCSC provides instructors with resources to assist with the design and development of courses that rely on technology to facilitate student learning; the primary contact for this is Online Education (online@ucsc.edu). I am aware of these resources and will make use of them as needed.
- Courses that rely on technology to facilitate student learning provide opportunities to expand accessibility beyond what is typically accomplished through in-person learning. Videos must be captioned, course readings made compatible with screen-readers, live transcripts added, and so on. I am aware of these resources and will make my course accessible to all students.
- Instructor presence is critical for student success. Teaching an asynchronous course shifts instructor responsibility more heavily to written and recorded engagement with students. This course will be designed such that instructor engagement with students will remain a central component of the educational experience.
- I pledge that the course will be designed such that TA workload remains within contract limits.
- I commit to use technologies approved for teaching by ITS and other campus oversight bodies. If I wish to adopt a new technology that does not appear on that list for use in a course, I commit to ensuring that the technology meets campus criteria for accessibility, privacy of student data, and data security. If you have questions about this, please contact its@ucsc.edu or fitc@ucsc.edu to discuss the technological tool in question.

- ❑ Asynchronous course content, and in particular pre-recorded video, occasionally requires updating. Instructors are encouraged to review and update their course content as needed.

Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), Graduate Council (GC) & Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI)

Synchronous Online Supplemental Questions & Checklist

Synchronous: Instruction that is characterized by its use of videoconferencing software to facilitate face-to-face, real-time interaction with students. Similar to courses taught in person, synchronous online courses are also characterized by their use of set meeting times that are advertised to students when they enroll.

Open-ended Questions

1. Explain why this course is appropriate in a synchronous online format. If there are student learning outcomes that may be addressed through the offering format, explain them here.
2. Discuss the placement of the course in the department or program's curriculum and whether it is an undergraduate major, undergraduate minor, or graduate degree requirement. If the course has an in-person counterpart, please discuss how the two versions would be scheduled in relation to each other, their expected enrollment levels, or any key differences between the two versions.
3. Describe the methods or approaches used to facilitate interaction between students to develop a sense of community. This can be accomplished through the use of active learning, small group work in breakout rooms or outside of scheduled class time, peer-review assignments, using ice-breakers early in the course, and so on.
4. Describe instructor presence in a typical week for the course. How is class time used, and how does the instructor engage with students outside of class, such as through feedback on assignments or in office hours?
5. Describe the resources and structure provided to students to help them navigate and succeed in this synchronous course. Examples include: using an introduction module; adopting a clear course structure; using the first synchronous meeting to orient students to the course; recording some or all synchronous sessions for students who are unable to attend; holding office hours twice per week and holding one in the morning and the other in the late afternoon to better accommodate students in different timezones.
6. Explain how exams, such as midterms and finals, are administered and explain what steps are taken to maintain academic integrity. If the course uses remote proctoring for

synchronously-administered exams, information regarding the method for remote proctoring (i.e., ProctorU or Zoom-based proctoring) must be included on the syllabus. Instructors are encouraged to provide an in-person option for students to take exams on the UCSC campus whenever possible.

Check-box Statements (required)

- UCSC provides instructors with resources to assist with the design and development of courses that rely on technology to facilitate student learning; the primary contact for this is Online Education (online@ucsc.edu). I am aware of these resources and will make use of them as needed.

- Courses that rely on technology to facilitate student learning provide opportunities to expand accessibility beyond what is typically accomplished through in-person learning. Videos must be captioned, course readings made compatible with screen-readers, live transcripts added, and so on. I am aware of these resources and will make my course accessible to all students.

- I commit to use technologies approved for teaching by ITS and other campus oversight bodies. If I wish to adopt a new technology that does not appear on that list for use in a course, I commit to ensuring that the technology meets campus criteria for accessibility, privacy of student data, and data security. If you have questions about this, please contact its@ucsc.edu or fitc@ucsc.edu to discuss the technological tool in question.

- I pledge that the course will be designed such that TA workload remains within contract limits.

Committee on Educational Policy (CEP), Graduate Council (GC) & Committee on Courses of Instruction (CCI)

Hybrid Course Checklist

Hybrid: A term used generally to describe models of teaching and learning that include multiple modalities in one course. These modalities might be: 1) asynchronous online and in-person (most common); 2) synchronous online and in-person; and, 3) online asynchronous and synchronous.

For the purpose of the hybrid course approval process, courses that take place with at least 50% of the standard contact hours in-person can use the hybrid course checklist below^[1].

Courses that will not have at least 50% of the standard contact hours in person should use either the Asynchronous Online or the Synchronous Online course approval processes. Determinations for the appropriate form should be made based on the dominant offering mode for the proposed course. To seek guidance on form selection, contact online@ucsc.edu.

Checklist (required)

- In a typical week in this course, at least 50% of class time includes required face-to-face interaction between the instructor and students. Face-to-face interaction should primarily take place in-person, but may occasionally use Zoom or other video-conferencing technologies.

- Midterm or final exams, where present, are administered using the in-person component, and no high-stakes exams are administered using remote proctoring. However, if midterm or final exams are administered remotely, using remote proctoring, or delivered in a take-home format, explain what steps are taken to maintain academic integrity. In the text box, please provide an explanation for CCI's review.

- UCSC provides instructors with resources to assist with the design and development of courses that rely on technology to facilitate student learning. Resources are available through the Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning (citl@ucsc.edu) and Online Education (online@ucsc.edu). I am aware of these resources and will make use of them as needed.

- Courses that rely on technology to facilitate student learning provide opportunities to expand accessibility beyond what is typically accomplished through in-person learning.

Videos can be captioned, course readings made compatible with screen-readers, live transcripts added, and so on. I am aware of these resources and will aim to make my course accessible to all students.

I commit to use technologies approved for teaching by ITS and other campus oversight bodies. If I wish to adopt a new technology that does not appear on that list for use in a course, I commit to ensuring that the technology meets campus criteria for accessibility, privacy of student data, and data security. If you have questions about this, please contact its@ucsc.edu or fitc@ucsc.edu to discuss the technological tool in question.

I pledge that the course will be designed such that TA workload remains within contract limits.

[1] Class time is defined as the number of instructional hours per week. An appropriate measure is the equivalent time spent in-person for a standard, fully in-person version of a course of the same credit count.