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March 8, 2021

Michael T. Brown
Provost and Executive Vice President
University of California

Re: ILTI Assessment Report and Recommendations

Dear Michael,

As requested, I distributed for systemwide Senate review the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) assessment report and recommendations for the future. Nine Academic Senate divisions and five systemwide committees (UCAADE, UCEP, UCORP, UCPB, and UCFW) submitted comments. These comments were discussed at Academic Council’s February 24 meeting and are attached for your reference.

ILTI is UC’s program for funding online and hybrid course development with the $10 million in annual funding Governor Brown asked UC to set aside for online learning, beginning in 2013. The report is the result of a review of ILTI former UC President Napolitano initiated in 2018 that details the work done since 2013 to foster online education at UC. The report recommends eliminating ILTI’s program for non-matriculated students currently known as UC Online; increasing the proportion of funding distributed to campuses; and focusing ILTI’s efforts in three key areas (managing cross-campus enrollments, coordinating systemwide instructional technology support, and a simplified grants program to support online course development). The report also recommends organizational changes that support additional faculty involvement, and maintaining ILTI at UCOP rather than transitioning the program to a campus.

I asked divisions and systemwide committees to consider the following questions when reviewing the ILTI report:

- Given that ILTI courses often have been developed in coordination with individual faculty rather than campus departments, how can ILTI develop a more appropriate and effective partnership with campuses such that it positively impacts the core UC teaching mission?
- What is the potential role and impact of ILTI on the core UC teaching mission?
- What can the systemwide ILTI program best provide for the campuses: instructional design guidance, best online teaching practices, multi-campus instructional innovations, cross-campus enrollment through the CCES platform? Other?
- What kind of systemwide courses should be created and how should their utility in achieving the UC teaching mission be assessed?
What should the ILTI governing structure be?

First, reviewers observed that the 2018 report is out of date, especially in the context of the recent transition to remote and online instruction during the pandemic. Council believes that the faculty’s current experiences with online teaching and learning will provide valuable information to inform next steps for ILTI, and in fact, some campuses have already launched task forces to examine online learning outcomes and best practices for pedagogy in online education. Another important new context to consider is the proposed 2021-22 state budget that asks UC to increase online courses by 10%. It would be wise for UC to wait for these data and circumstances to evolve more fully before proceeding in any significant way on ILTI.

Next, you will see in the enclosed letter that Senate reviewers are divided on the value of ILTI to the UC system. Many are skeptical at best about the benefits of ILTI to existing campus efforts to design online courses and collaborate with other campuses on courses. And while reviewers appreciate ILTI’s role in facilitating cross-campus enrollment, they are also concerned about the low demand for cross-campus ILTI courses and the high attrition rates in those courses. Reviewers strongly support the recommendation to send more ILTI funding directly to campuses to support local online education efforts, given their view that campuses are better equipped to determine which online courses are most needed or are of the greatest benefit to their students.

Another concern is that courses offered through ILTI do not always seem well-coordinated with department needs, or with the needs of the UC system, and that ILTI is forming too many partnerships with individual faculty rather than with departments. We want to ensure that ILTI works closely with departments to discuss their needs and to obtain course approvals for general education, major, and equivalency credit in advance of the course offering. In turn, we recognize that there may be opportunities for departments to more effectively engage with ILTI.

There is more support in the Senate for focusing ILTI’s mission on cross-campus enrollment efforts that look strategically at the online learning needs of the UC system. We believe that ILTI could play a useful systemwide role in funding courses that help students satisfy requirements in impacted majors and help them fulfill time to degree requirements; courses without enough enrollment to be viable on a single campus, unusual languages such as Sanskrit; high-demand or specialty courses; and other urgent curricular needs.

The letters also touch on labor issues, specifically who teaches ILTI courses (ladder rank faculty, Teaching Assistants, or others), and how the balance of workloads in a department or campus is impacted. Some reviewers also expressed concerns about academic freedom and intellectual property rights in terms of the design, approval, and maintenance of ILTI courses. Council understands that ILTI courses are created and approved on individual campuses, not by ILTI, and we agree about need to ensure that authority continues to reside within Senate governance structures.

We encourage you to read and consider the full set of comments. In short, while we have many concerns about ILTI, we also see opportunities for re-envisioning and improving the program to better support the core UC mission. Thank you for the opportunity to opine. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions.
Sincerely,

Mary Gauvain, Chair
Academic Council

Cc: Chief of Staff to the Provost Peterson
    Academic Council
    Senate Directors
    Executive Director Baxter

Encl.
February 17, 2021

MARY GAUVAIN
Chair, Academic Council

Recommendations for Future State report

Dear Chair Gauvain;

On February 8, 2021, the Council of the Berkeley Division (DIVCO) discussed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI): Recommendations for Future State report, informed by comments from our local committees on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA); Courses of Instruction (COCI); and Undergraduate Council (UGC). The comments from the Computing and Information Technology (CIT) were submitted after the DIVCO discussion, and all of the committee comments are appended in their entirety.

Since the inception of the systemwide Innovative Learning Technology Initiative, and especially over the past year, the use of remote learning and online education has increased. A review of ILTI is therefore very timely, and this report sparked fruitful discussion at the DIVCO meeting. Several members stressed that online education is not the only important modality of innovative learning technology, generating a discussion about the broader pedagogical mission of ILTI, as well as whether ILTI is adding value to the mission that it was intended to fill. There was consensus about the need for clearer academic direction and less administrative complexity—for example, we should not have structures that duplicate and compete with our own Extension programs, or complex grant programs that are costly to administer.

Overall, Berkeley DIVCO offered strong support for the statement in the comment from CAPRA, that “a strategic vision for the best and highest use of state funding should be articulated and implemented, more functions and resources should be decentralized to the campuses, and the Academic Senate should be given a greater role in governing in governing ILTI’s successor.”
Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Johnson-Hanks
Professor of Demography and Sociology
Chair, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate

Enclosures

cc: Ronald Cohen, Vice Chair, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate
    Paul Fine, Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
    Estelle Tarica, Chair, Committee on Courses of Instruction
    Richard Kern, Chair, Undergraduate Council
    Deirdre Mulligan, Chair, Committee on Computing and Information Technology
    Jocelyn Surla Banaria, Executive Director, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate
    Sumei Quiggle, Associate Director staffing Undergraduate Council
    Deborah Dobin, Senate Analyst, Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
    Rachel Marias Dezendorf, Senate Analyst, Committee on Courses of Instruction
Re: CAPRA comments on Systemwide Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) recommendations and update

At today’s meeting, CAPRA discussed the report, *Innovative Learning Technology Initiative: Recommendations for Future State*, along with the 2020 update to the report. ILTI was reviewed by UC Provost Brown’s office and Huron Consulting in 2018. The review was released in a slightly updated form in August 2020 for Academic Senate feedback. This report for CAPRA addresses only CAPRA-related concerns around planning and budget.

Summary

Online education is an ongoing priority of UC and its campuses, ever more so in light of this past year’s experience with COVID-19. Using state funds for impact and effectiveness is essential, which requires focused and strategic planning and resource allocation. Faculty oversight of online ventures needs to be at the center of UC’s concerns in order to meet our instructional mission.

The Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) is a UC Office of the President (UCOP) program to spur and facilitate the development, deployment, and availability of online courses taught by UC faculty. Its principal audience is (at this point) the UC undergraduate student population. It has existed since FY 2013, supported by a distinct “handshake” funding arrangement from the state on the order of $10M annually.

Through several funding streams deriving from the state allocation, ILTI has supported the development and at least occasional offering of several hundred online courses. It has made some progress on a core goal of allowing cross-campus enrollments of UC undergraduates in online courses, with estimated successful course completion that may now be on the order of 1,300 students per year. Key issues in the report include improving oversight and governance, narrowing in on a strong and strategic mission/vision statement, ending enrollment of non-matriculated (non-UC) students, rebalancing ILTI’s budget to better support and avoid
competition with UC campuses’ continuing online education efforts, streamlining processes and reallocating staff effort, de-siloing it from UC central IT operations, and determining what use to make of the investment in a Cross-Campus Enrollment System (CCES).

Although some may want to see ILTI disbanded entirely, the bulk of the review’s recommendations make sense, and some should arguably be stronger. In particular, a strategic vision for the best and highest use of state funding should be articulated and implemented, more functions and resources should be decentralized to the campuses, and the Academic Senate should be given a greater role in governing ILTI’s successor. It is an open question whether ILTI’s successor should play a greater part in managing cross-campus enrollment systems for other programs and coordinating instructional technology procurement and support across the UC campuses.

ILTI background

ILTI was formed at UCOP in FY 2013 in response to pressure from Governor Jerry Brown, accompanied by $10M of state funding that became an annual special allocation (reduced to $9M in FY 2017). ILTI’s original purpose was to help deal with UC undergraduate enrollment growth by reducing bottlenecks in course availability through creating and hosting online courses open to students from any UC campus. It did this by centrally resourcing campus online education efforts with various funding streams; resourcing and assisting UC faculty directly to develop courses; and creating central programs and infrastructure, including program management and planning, course articulation with the campuses and their departments, marketing and student support efforts, a Canvas learning management system, and the Cross-Campus Enrollment System (CCES) to integrate with campus Student Information Systems.

ILTI came into being after, and absorbed, the UC Online Education (UCOE or UC Online) initiative, an awkward program launched in 2010 to drive online education across the UC system and spur new online courses, in addition to those being developed on the campuses. UCOE grew out of Christopher Edley’s troubled plan to envision an online UC campus and to generate revenue through non-matriculated online students. (A partial account is provided in Bowen and Tobin, *Locus of Authority: The Evolution of Faculty Roles in the Governance of Higher Education* (2015), 120-126, 251-260.)

The Academic Senate’s University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) and Academic Council have previously articulated strong expectations that ILTI, and UC online education efforts overall, must be held to a high standard of strategic assessment and Senate oversight. A 2014 Blue Ribbon Panel report and related documentation are part of the background for the current review of ILTI (https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/BJ_DorrreBRP_Report.pdf).

Data and findings

Through course development funding, ILTI has grown a large catalog of 277 courses taught by UC faculty, of which a much smaller number (not specified) are offered each term. The largest number (not specified) are described as “specialty courses,” which do not fit a particular strategic
profile. CAPRA members wonder if low-enrollment specialty courses at individual campuses could benefit by allowing enrollment from other campuses. There are also an intermediate number (not specified) of common high-demand courses (introductory or prerequisite courses), and a small number (not specified) of innovative cross-campus courses. The catalog includes courses taught by faculty from each of the UC undergraduate campuses. It is not clear how the portfolio of ILTI-supported courses compares to the portfolio of online courses supported by the campuses or by mixed funding.

Cross-campus enrollment, one of the original hopes that was placed in ILTI, is a labor- and communication-intensive process at both UCOP and the campuses. It requires course articulation, marketing, and tracking of course offerings at the campuses term by term, and it uses automated or in some cases manual integration of student records on the campuses. It appears that completed cross-campus enrollments have continued to grow, with 3,768 students initially enrolling in and presumably about 1,300 students completing cross-campus courses in AY 2019-20.

Partial data are provided for some years of the program about enrollments, student persistence, and types of credit UC students have received. These are incomplete, not provided in tabular form, and sometimes a challenge to interpret. For instance, enrollment data often appear to include the large fraction (in the case of cross-campus enrollment, roughly 65%) of students who do not complete a course, and numbers of ILTI-supported courses include all courses whose faculty developers have received ILTI funds by whatever stream.

Overall state funding is hard to track and not broken out in the review by different funding categories. One exception is the CCES, whose development and integration (so far with 8 of the 10 campuses) has been supported by $13M of ILTI funding to date, allocated roughly 2:1 between UCOP and the campuses. It has enabled the cross-campus enrollment of possibly several thousand students at a significant per-student cost. Another exception is the central ILTI office, which has 22 positions and a current annual spend of $2.8M in personnel costs. Oversight and planning of ILTI’s financial strategies seem to have been limited. Although it is not specified in the review, a best guess is that ILTI has been the recipient of roughly $76M in state funding over 8 years, of which something more than 60% (roughly $46M) has been given to the campuses for block grants, campus course support, and other purposes such as CCES integration, while the remainder (roughly $30M) has been used at UCOP.

Non-matriculated students have made up a tiny fraction of the students, about 600 total over the duration of the program, distributed across over 220 sporadically and non-strategically offered courses and subject to the instructor’s approval. They can get general education credit that may transfer to a UC campus and pay two to three times as much as students in online classes offered in UC campus Extension programs. They are a minor revenue stream and overall run at a deficit, having only barely come to break even in recent years. The review acknowledges that ILTI has had no good way to track finances associated with non-matriculated students.

Despite limits to the evidence presented, the review provides enough explicit or implicit information to ground an overall assessment that ILTI, if it is to be continued with the support of an ongoing state allocation, needs to change in several ways.
Recommendations

Following are CAPRA’s comments on the recommendations in the report:

Appoint a single, faculty leader (Executive Director) on the model of other systemwide academic programs. This is essential.

End non-matriculated student enrollment and shutter UC Online in its current form. This is appropriate and has already been done. The fact that this program persisted through years of difficulty while running deficits is problematic.

Continue ILTI in restructured form, redirect it more strategically, and rebrand it as UC Online. As long as the scope is well-defined, the separate state funding stream continues, and funds are well-used, this is appropriate. There is a risk if the “handshake” state funding stream is discontinued. If that happens, the program should be shut down, rather than diverting other resources to support it.

Simplify funding streams to campuses by reducing reporting burden and using only two funding modalities (block grants and direct faculty proposals), instead of the current nine. It is unclear whether it could be more effective and efficient to simply give block grants to campuses, and no argument is presented either way. The review recommends eliminating perverse incentives and competition that have derived from the historically higher dollar value of ILTI awards than campus awards for online course development. If the award levels are the same, however, the programs seem duplicative, and additional burdens may be placed on faculty to apply to two sources for the same purpose.

Direct a larger percentage of funding to the campuses through these modalities. Currently, about 60% of the funds come to the campuses, with 40% kept by UCOP. We question whether this is the best use of the funds.

Assess whether the Cross-Campus Enrollment System (CCES) can be used to support student record coordination for programs beyond online education, such as the UC Education Abroad Program (UCEAP) or even, in some future phase, community college transfers, and whether the program can be managed sustainably to fulfill these goals. It is appropriate to make this assessment. Campus registrars and program leadership are reported to be supportive.

Transfer the small and isolated CCES technical infrastructure team to UCOP’s Information Technology Systems department. This is appropriate and essential for sustainability, risk mitigation, and efficient management. Maintain an enrollment operations team focused on facilitating cross-campus enrollment. This is appropriate and should be systematically evaluated for effectiveness. Move into coordinating systemwide instructional technology procurement. This is appropriate at the level of one staff position, if campus CIOs or Chief Academic Technology Officers see value in it. Maintain an instructional design team to support faculty receiving course development grants. This is questionable, as it duplicates
services on the campus. Arguably, separate course development grants to faculty should be ended, as suggested above. Develop a group of campus representatives, possibly staffed by student interns, for marketing to students and providing feedback. This is appropriate. A decentralized model is more likely to succeed than central marketing, and central costs will be reduced.

Create stronger and more strategic governance with guiding documents and processes and representation from the campuses, the Academic Senate, and UC senior management. This is appropriate and essential. The model of a Governing Council is sensible but must include faculty representation, not just administrators and staff as is apparently proposed. In addition to the Chair of the Academic Senate participating as ex officio member, there should be a representative of UCEP. Where the Governing Council (or similar body) operates by voting, it should be clear that both Academic Senate members have voting roles.

Create a strategic plan for UC Online. This is essential. It is touched on in the review and must be at the center of the effort. If programmatic goals, especially strategic and reliable course offerings and much better cross-campus enrollment, are to be foregrounded, rather than routine ongoing operations, the strategic plan will be critical. Going forward, effectiveness measures rather than sheer amount of activity should be at the center of UC Online planning.

In summary, this is a difficult issue. On the one hand, online education is part of our reality and will definitely have a larger profile in the future, and the Governor and the State legislature view online education as an important tool to broaden access to a UC education. On the other hand, the ILTI’s ad hoc history and administration appears to be a very inefficient use of resources and has very little faculty and Academic Senate oversight. It is critical that faculty take the lead on UC online education.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the report and update.

With best regards,

Paul Fine, Chair
Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
PROFESSOR JENNIFER JOHNSON-HANKS
Chair, 2020-2021 Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate

Re: COCI’s Comments on the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative Review

At its meeting of January 15, 2021, the Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI) discussed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review. We discussed the three broad recommendations for restructuring what is now ILTI, as well as also more general issues related to ILTI’s original conception and the role that the University of California Office of the President (UCOP) might play in supporting educational technology innovations on each campus.

COCI members feel that the Review is already somewhat outdated or anachronistic because of the rapid transformation in online education and new uses of educational technology during the pandemic. It does not speak to the moment or reflect the lessons learned in the past year. But regarding the narrower question of the future of ILTI, the report contains some valuable recommendations.

COCI members expressed support for the recommendation to eliminate Non-Matriculated Student enrollment. COCI members agree that this effort to attract Non-Matriculated Students competes with and detracts from the Concurrent Enrollment process with University Extension.

COCI members also expressed support for the decentralizing thrust of the recommendations. COCI members feel that UCOP is not equipped to administer a program that unifies policy or other efforts relating to educational technology across the system. Rather, UCOP should understand its role as supporting and facilitating individual campuses to set priorities about their educational technology needs and the areas where they’d like to innovate and focus their energies.

The original thrust of ILTI was “online education.” Members pointed out that there are tremendous needs in the area of instructional technology that include more than online education. COCI members therefore appreciate that the report recommends UCOP support for instructional technology understood in this broader sense.

In this vein, members suggested that those faculty and staff on campus who are on the frontlines when it comes to supporting educational technology for instruction should be given a lead role in the consultation process that sets campus priorities in this domain (e.g. Digital Learning Services). Put another way, UCOP can support priorities that are developed on the ground at the local level.

Members reiterated an important point that COCI has offered at various times: instructional modes do not conform to the binary online v. offline. While support for online education is
important, members feel that even more important is support for technology needs that sustain many different kinds of instruction.

Finally, COCI members noted with dismay the startlingly high non-completion rate in cross-campus enrollment courses. We discussed the possibility that the numbers may be misleading (e.g. these may include students who drop the course in the add/drop period). The lack of context and discussion regarding this data point is frustrating.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Estelle Tarica
January 21, 2021

PROFESSOR JENNIFER JOHNSON-HANKS
Chair, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate

Re: UGC comments on the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative Report

Dear Chair Johnson-Hanks,


ILTI was proposed to help UC undergraduates get the courses they needed when they needed them, satisfy degree requirements, and graduate on time. Besides development of online courses, ILTI created the Cross-Campus Enrollment System. According to the report, ILTI has supported the development of 458 online courses, and cross-campus enrollment has increased over the years. However, the proportion of students who do not complete ILTI courses is larger than the proportion who do complete them (for example, AY17 saw the highest number of students enrolling cross-campus in ILTI courses to-date – 1,364 students – but 834 of those students did not complete their course (p. 12 of report)). The report concludes that now is an appropriate time to reevaluate the structure and priorities for ILTI, and to re-envision how to make the best use of subject matter expertise and funding.

The general consensus from UGC’s discussion was that it was not a good idea for UCOP to have strong involvement in innovative learning technology initiatives (ILTI Recommendation 3), as these are most effectively vetted and developed locally on the respective campuses. (It was noted that ILTI’s mission seems to have crept into the Senate’s purview by making decisions involving course content). Nor was it considered desirable for UCOP to provide centralized Information Technology services for the campuses (ILTI Recommendation 2). Rather, members felt that the most positive path forward for ILTI would be 1) to allocate funds directly to the campuses so they can vet and develop their own learning technology initiatives, and 2) to negotiate agreements
with resource providers (e.g., Canvas, Piazza, a good proctoring program) to get systemwide leverage on pricing. UGC found ILTI Recommendation 1 (eliminate non-matriculated student enrollment efforts) non-controversial.

Members endorsed the ILTI Vision Statement in the report and agreed that sharing resources among campuses was worthwhile, but some noted that ILTI did not always work as intended, and some campuses used the funds to develop their own online courses that were not intended to be offered across campuses. One member emphasized the desirability of developing modular resources (rather than whole stand-alone courses) that could be used in locally relevant combinations. Modular course content could be shared through a repository (such as the California Digital Library) and could be drawn upon by multiple courses throughout the UC system.

Sincerely,

Richard G. Kern
Chair, Undergraduate Council
Division Chair Jennifer Johnson-Hanks  
Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate  
University of California  

Re: Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)  

Dear Division Chair Jennifer Johnson-Hanks,  

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI).  

We apologize for the late comments but the Committee did not have adequate time to gather appropriate background and discuss this and the IS-12 during the close of the semester. We prioritized providing the IS-12 comments, and hope these comments will still be helpful although tardy.  

This week Shawna Dark, Chief Academic Technology Officer and Executive Director of Research, Teaching, and Learning shared her perspectives with the Committee, and Jenn Stringer, Associate Vice Chancellor IT and Chief Information Officer provided us with additional context on the initiative. This was necessary for the CIT to provide meaningful feedback.  

The Committee identified one area of specific concern based on our historic involvement with UC wide decisions about technology. We are concerned that Section C. Coordinate Systemwide Instructional Technology Efforts may diminish campus insight into and influence over UCB and UC wide technology investments. We appreciate the need for coordination and collaboration, and of course have a shared interest in avoiding needless and costly duplication, however, in the past UC Berkeley specific reviews have provided novel input and identified challenges that other campuses and other review processes have not. For this reason we are concerned about replacing the current coordination approach with a consolidation of this function at UCOP.  

As we understand, the Information Technology Leadership Council (ITLC) has various committees including a funded procurement position that supports the system-wide perspective. Looking to pursue system-wide contracts is clearly prudent. It’s unclear to
the Committee whether the proposed new organizational structure will do that more effectively, but it does seem likely to diminish the policy inputs of the various campuses. In the past UCOP has identified programs for use that have met with objections from Senate Committees as well as IT Administrators at Berkeley. Given that we already have a coordinated procurement process in place along with other processes to promote coordination and collaboration where needs are mutual, we are unsure of the added cost savings, and concerned about diminishing the campuses ability to provide feedback and adopt technologies that align with both UC wide policies and UCB’s distinct needs.

Sincerely,
Deirdre K. Mulligan, Chair, Professor, School of Information
Michael Eisen, Professor, Molecular and Cell Biology
Michael Laguerre, Professor, African American Studies
Kimiko Ryokai, Associate Professor, School of Information
Paul Schwartz, Professor, School of Law
Matthew Welch, Professor, Molecular and Cell Biology
Parth Nobel, Representative, Associated Students of the University of California
Jenn Stringer, Chief Information Officer & Associate Vice Chancellor Information Technology (ex-officio)
Mary Gauvain  
Chair, Academic Council

RE: Review of Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)

Dear Mary,

The review of ILTI was forwarded to all standing committees of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate. Five committees responded: Courses of Instruction (COCI), Graduate Council (GC), Information Technology (CIT), Planning and Budget (CPB), and Undergraduate Council (UGC).

Below, we structure our comments into the questions we received from the Systemwide Senate.

**Given that ILTI courses often have been developed in coordination with individual faculty rather than with campus departments, how can ILTI develop a more appropriate and effective partnership with campuses such that it positively impacts the core teaching mission of the University?**

COCI and UGC expressed concern about ILTI forming partnerships with individual faculty rather than partnerships at the departmental level. This practice was not mentioned in the report, but according to UGC, on which several department chairs serve, these contracts with individual faculty “are occurring with little or no prior consultation or coordination with Department and Program chairs. This diverts staffing resources for traditional course offerings. The Departments are in a sense subsidizing the ILTI courses by loaning out their faculty, but with no say in the matter.” As COCI notes, departments and programs should have greater input into the application process for new ILTI courses “to ensure that these courses fit within departmental plans and priorities for curriculum.” UGC also notes that it is important to know who reviews courses hosted by ILTI for instructional quality and general education designations.

**What is the potential role and impact of ILTI on the core teaching mission of the University?**

Committees see ILTI as supporting the core teaching mission but not fundamental to it. ILTI’s activities are akin to the role of the Academic Technology Service or the Center for Educational Effectiveness at the UC Davis campus, which have clear roles in supporting our faculty and academic programs’ core teaching mission. However, they neither cross over into the jurisdiction of academic programs nor bypass Senate bodies in academic review processes. ILTI should observe similar boundaries.
What can the systemwide ILTI program best provide for the campuses: instructional design guidance, best online teaching practices, multicampus instructional innovations, cross-campus enrollment through the CCES platform? Other?

UGC remarks that ILTI should not necessarily offer instructional design “guidance,” rather instructional design “support.” Such support could help faculty “learn what options for online instruction are available, what practices other faculty have found useful, what the evolving research says about online instructional techniques and student success, and how to implement their online course design.” COCI concurs that the most productive and appropriate role for ILTI is to “support the design of, innovation in, and best practices for remote instruction for both hybrid and online courses, including those that are not open to cross campus enrollment. In this effort, ILTI should be careful to coordinate with and not duplicate efforts of the units responsible for instructional design that exist at each campus (i.e., Center for Educational Effectiveness at UC Davis).” ILTI could also help investigate techniques for online assessment that better replicate the effectiveness of in-person assessments.

Committees appreciate ILTI’s role in facilitating cross-campus enrollment and think it could expand to other systemwide academic programs, such as UC Center Sacramento and UCEAP. CPB notes that it can still be difficult for students to register for courses outside of their home campuses and suggest that ILTI continue enhancing its platform to simplify this process and remove barriers.

Lastly, ILTI could continue to offer financial support to encourage faculty to develop online courses or sequences of courses. As noted, this financial support should flow through programs rather than individual faculty to ensure program involvement and long-term course and program stability.

What kinds of systemwide courses should be created and how should their utility in achieving the UC teaching mission be assessed?

UGC suggests that ILTI could help provide alternative access to high-demand courses (e.g., computer science for non-majors) or specialty courses requiring cross-campus collaboration. COCI concurs that ILTI could play a limited role in supporting specialty courses but expressed overall concern that systemwide courses may undermine campus and departmental control of curriculum. UGC, COCI, and CIT all expressed concerns about the large percentage (60%) of students that register and then drop ILTI courses, the reasons for which are unclear.

GC notes that the expansion of online undergraduate instruction could have consequences on graduate education, such as teaching and funding practices. These consequences are not evaluated in the report.

What should the ILTI governing structure be?

ILTI courses and offerings should fall within Senate governance structures. Committees agree that the majority of ILTI funding should flow through to campuses to support local efforts for online education. UCOP and ILTI, as administrative units, are not appropriate organizations to determine which online courses are most needed or are of the greatest benefit to students.

The Davis Division appreciates the opportunity to comment.
Sincerely,

Richard P. Tucker, Ph.D.
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
University of California, Davis

Enclosed: Davis Division Committee Responses

c: Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
   Michael LaBriola, Assistant Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
   Edwin M. Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
RE: Review of Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)

The Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI) has discussed the Review of Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI). As requested, please find COCI responses to the questions provided by Systemwide Academic Senate Leadership below.

1. Given that ILTI courses often have been developed in coordination with individual faculty rather than with campus departments, how can ILTI develop a more appropriate and effective partnership with campuses such that it positively impacts the core teaching mission of the University?

2. What is the potential role and impact of ILTI on the core teaching mission of the University?

4. What kinds of systemwide courses should be created and how should their utility in achieving the UC teaching mission be assessed?

All committee members share the concern that systemwide courses may undermine campus and departmental control of curriculum. Some members suggest that ILTI should play a more limited role and only support systemwide courses that are too specialized for each individual campus to support but which have sufficient student demand systemwide to warrant teaching them. Specialized language courses, such as Punjabi, are one example. Additional concern was expressed about offering systemwide courses, either lower or upper division, that are prerequisites for campus-based courses because the structure and content of the prerequisite course affects what can or cannot be taught in the subsequent courses.

In addition, concern was expressed that ILTI coordination with individual faculty members instead of departments can divert teaching resources away from departments’ core teaching mission and may weaken departments’ ability to deliver its curriculum. We suggest greater departmental input into the application process for new ILTI courses to ensure that these courses fit within departmental plans and priorities for curriculum.

3. What can the systemwide ILTI program best provide for the campuses: instructional design guidance, best online teaching practices, multicampus instructional innovations, cross-campus enrollment through the CCES platform? Other?

The Committee feels that the most productive and appropriate role for ILTI is to support the design of, innovation in and best practices for remote instruction for both hybrid and online courses, including those that are not open to cross campus enrollment. In this effort, ILTI should be careful to coordinate with and not duplicate efforts of the units responsible for instructional design that exist at each campus (i.e., Center for Educational Effectiveness at UC Davis).

The committee sees potential value in ILTI supporting cross-campus enrollment in systemwide academic programs such as UC Center Sacramento and UCEAP through the CCES platform. However, to fully
support ILTI in this role, we would need to see endorsements of the CCES platform by relevant stakeholders, including Registrars Offices and the relevant programs themselves.

There exists mixed support for multi-campus instructional innovations for reasons discussed above.

5. What should the ILTI governing structure be?

The committee was glad to see recognition of some significant problems faced by the ILTI program, including the large percentage (60%) of students registering and then dropping ILTI courses and a relatively small percentage of program funding making its way to campuses. If the ILTI program is to move forward, we recommend incorporating critical self-evaluation on a higher frequency basis to diagnose and remedy these types of problems early on. We suggest the Office of the President consider redirecting the majority of the ILTI funding to the individual campuses to support local campus efforts for online education.
RE: Review of Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)

Graduate Council completed the review of the report on Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI). Graduate Council found the ILTI report to be informative and detailed. Graduate Council noted that the report focused on undergraduate education and thus other units may be better positioned than Graduate Council to provide feedback.

However, in the list of documents and datasets reported on Table 6, a document pertaining to graduate education is listed (Graduate & Professional Program Market Analysis), which is described to report internal research conducted by ILTI staff to explore the online Graduate and Professional education industry and the potential for ILTI to enter it. The contents of this analysis would be of interest to Graduate Council, but they were not explicitly discussed in this report.

Graduate Council wishes to highlight the importance of considering the consequences of the expansion of online undergraduate instruction for graduate education. These consequences were not evaluated in the report. A significant shift towards on-line instruction has the potential to transform access, teaching, and funding practices for graduate students in the UC system. It is important to evaluate the impact of online undergraduate instruction in preparing undergraduate students for the future pursuit of graduate education. As for enrolled graduate students, we recommend that the consequences of online courses for enrolled graduate students be evaluated, including potential disadvantages in the quality of the experience, reduction of resources and funding for graduate students who serve as Teaching Assistants for programs that deliver a substantial portion of their instruction online.

Sincerely,

Dean Tantillo
Chair, Graduate Council Committee
Richard Tucker  
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate  

RE: Request for Consultation – Review of Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)  

Dear Richard:  

The Committee on Information Technology has reviewed the RFC – Review of Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) We have two comments.  

The first comment is that we support the recommendation that most technological aspects of the ILTI/UC Online be centralized for the reasons stated in the document. There appears to be little reason for individual UC campuses to have to build out and manage the infrastructure.  

The second comment regards the observation of a large percentage of students who seemed to have dropped the ILTI courses. We believe it would be beneficial to thoroughly examine the root cause of this and then create a plan of action to mitigate the issue, so as to not waste time and resources.  

Sincerely,  

Matt Bishop  
Chair, Committee on Information Technology  

Edwin M. Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Richard Tucker  
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate

RE: Review of Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) has reviewed and discussed the Review of Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI). CPB offers the following feedback for consideration:

- There was some concern with how this review equated innovation with online education.
- One suggestion that UC could consider going forward is to encourage greater collaboration (rather than competition) between campuses, in which cross-campus versions of a course could be offered by experts at various UCs.
- It is still very difficult for students to register for courses outside their home campuses. One suggestion is for the ILTI’s cross-campus registration system to simplify this process, and remove barriers. The intent to offer more courses online and encourage broader participation in these courses is a good, but in practice the current system does not measure up. Fixing this will require cooperation from the campus registrar offices.
- The proposed move to allocate most funds as block grants to campuses is regarded as positive. The Office of the President is not an appropriate organization to prioritize which online courses are most urgently needed and/or of the greatest benefit to students.

We found the report to be less than useful to answer questions that seem relevant to its review at this time. It is two years old and, contrary to what is suggested in the cover letter, does not provide a blueprint for a new “UC Online.” CPB believes there are unrealized opportunities but firstly, we need a system that encourages rather than discourages course cross listing and cross-enrollment by students.

CPB appreciates the opportunity to comment.
Richard Tucker  
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate

**RE:** Request for Consultation: Review of Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)

Dear Richard:

The Undergraduate Council (UGC) reviewed the Request for Consultation (RFC) of the Review of Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI). Several points of concern arose while discussing the Systemwide Academic Senate Leadership’s queries.

UGC is supportive of online courses and appreciative of UCOP and ILTI’s efforts and success at creating cross-campus offerings. However, now that ILTI and the ongoing emergency remote instruction has shown that faculty can offer many courses online, UGC energetically urges Senate Leadership to take the closest possible look at both jurisdictional issues and the budget model to understand how the rapid expansion of this Initiative could affect program quality, the sustainability of operations within academic units, and student experience.

As a matter of language, UGC would caution that ILTI was established to support faculty and programs in carrying out the core teaching mission of the University, not to itself “impact the core teaching mission of the University.” Senate Leadership may wish to clarify this messaging when corresponding with UCOP.

From this point, we address each of the queries from Senate Leadership in order:

1. *Given that ILTI courses often have been developed in coordination with individual faculty rather than with campus departments, how can ILTI develop a more appropriate and effective partnership with campuses such that it positively impacts the core teaching mission of the University?*

   a) ILTI’s method of forming partnerships with individual faculty rather than departments is a big problem. UGC members expressed the view that ILTI partnerships for course development should only be established in coordination with programs, as they drain programs of faculty instructors for traditional programs during the terms that faculty are engaged in the design or teaching of ILTI-related courses. Currently, these contracts with individual faculty are occurring with little or no prior consultation or coordination with Department and Program chairs. This diverts staffing resources for traditional course offerings. The Departments are in a sense subsidizing the ILTI courses by loaning out their faculty, but with no say in the matter.

   b) UGC is also concerned about the use of the term “host courses” in the context of ILTI’s activities. Members appreciate that the courses go through a campus approval process. However, typically academic units determine course offerings and offer the courses themselves. Is ILTI determining course offerings online? Is ILTI taking on a role similar to Administrative units like the UC Washington program and the UC Davis PE program?

   c) UGC already has expressed deep concern that UC Washington program courses, which also go through a campus approvals process when created, but which (since moving to
UCOP’s jurisdiction) are now taught year after year without any Senate oversight through an Undergraduate Program Review or Special Academic Programs process. UGC has expressed concern that courses offered in Administrative units rather than academic units like the PE program, could be discontinued without prior Senate consultations. Are we setting up the same situation but on a potentially massive scale with ILTI?

d) UGC feels it is extremely important to know who reviews courses hosted by ILTI for instructional quality and whether this is done by a Senate body. As the roster of ILTI courses expands, failing to get on top of this could generate problems in WASC reviews. Closely related, System Regulation 544 recently was revised to allow for a process to recognize General Education designations for some ILTI courses on a case-by-case basis. Who assesses these courses on a regular basis to assure that the minimum elements for these literacies are fulfilled?

2. What is the potential role and impact of ILTI on the core teaching mission of the University?

As stated above, UGC does not perceive that ILTI’s role is to have an “impact” on the core teaching mission, which is set by the Regents and carried out by faculty and academic units under the oversight of the Senate. ILTI’s role for the University system could be envisioned as more similar to the partnership between Instructional and Educational Technology’s Academic Technology Service and the Center for Educational Effectiveness on our campus. The jurisdiction for these offices and their roles in supporting the faculty and programs’ core teaching mission is clear and undisputed. Due to their rapid growth, ILTI’s activities seem to be crossing over into the jurisdiction of academic units and also bypassing Senate bodies for program review. The Initiative is now too mature to continue in this way.

In addition, members wondered if the University has conducted a study to assess demand for online courses among UC students. It would be helpful to understand what sort of role might be perceived as useful to them and how they perceive the quality or usefulness of online courses in specific disciplines or contexts. Members thought it feasible that online offerings may offer increased access to students who are caregivers or are working to support themselves while taking classes.

Members recommended that ILTI remain a course-based initiative, not a degree- or program-oriented initiative.

3. What can the systemwide ILTI program best provide for the campuses: instructional design guidance, best online teaching practices, multicampus instructional innovations, cross-campus enrollment through the CCES platform? Other?

   a) ILTI could offer financial support for programs who wish to encourage faculty to develop online courses or find ways to offer online versions of particular courses or sequences of courses.
      o ILTI currently offers funding, but coordinated with individual instructors, bypassing our system of program development which is deeply rooted in academic units and within well-defined processes of shared governance and Senate program review.
      o UGC hopes that Senate Leadership considers helping UCOP understand how disruptive the current approach (individual contracts with individual
instructors, outside of programs) now is and immediately redirect coordination through the Chairs of the academic units and their Deans.

- The current funding model with individual instructors does not result in self-sustaining courses. Teaching hybrid and online courses is often more labor-intensive for faculty, but the financial incentive from ILTI for this work stops with the design phase. Therefore, these courses are more likely to become unstaffed after being taught a few times, or end when a faculty member retires, takes leave, or separates from the University.

- What happens to a course after a faculty member decides not to teach it? Can ILTI keep offering it without the faculty member’s participation or consent?

- Funding for Teaching Assistants for ILTI courses is not guaranteed over the life of the course and, most troubling, it is unclear whether TA funding is allocated in coordination with departments both to ensure good learning outcomes for undergraduates and allow the usual planning for stability of graduate programs that occurs within College planning processes.

- If they have not already done so, UGC urges the Davis Division Academic Senate Committee on Planning and Budget to scrutinize the agreements determining the direction of revenue flows from ILTI courses, as well as the design of the financial incentives for faculty to design or teach ILTI courses. It sounds like the University is poised to expand ILTI’s role and offerings. What will be the budget implications of this expansion for campuses and academic units? UGC members did not know where the revenues from ILTI courses end up, if they reach the College or Department in the same way that revenues from in-person courses do.

- Materials need to be updated frequently, roughly one-third of the course each year. Who assures that this happens? The current financial model may not provide adequate incentives and the current system adequate oversight.

b) UGC appreciates ILTI’s role in facilitating cross-campus enrollment. That role is consistent with an Administrative unit.

c) ILTI should not offer “instructional design guidance” for online courses, but rather “instructional design support,” similar to the role of the Center for Educational Effectiveness.

d) Faculty can determine what is “best practice” for their courses. ILTI’s support would be appreciated by many faculty to help them learn what options for online instruction are available, what practices other faculty have found useful, what the evolving research says about online instructional techniques and student success, and how to implement their online course design. UGC is concerned about the prospect of an Administrative unit conveying to faculty that it is determining and handing down to them what best practices are for instruction.

e) It would be very helpful if ILTI (and CEE) could continue investigating and, if needed, pioneering techniques for online assessment that better replicate the effectiveness of assessments in in-person instruction. The current recommendations to change the form of assessment are not appropriate in many situations. Until more consistently reliable methods are identified, this will
continue to be a limitation to online instruction that the emergency remote instruction has made more obvious.

f) Closely related to (e), UGC urges that any planned expansion of online course offerings at the campus or system level occur only after an overall assessment of student and instructor experience under remote instruction during the pandemic.

g) ILTI could be very helpful in establishing standardized technical requirements for accessing courses (for instance, students taking these courses should expect to have a computer with X processing capacity, internet connection with X speed, and X type of software). ILTI could also work with academic units and programs to establish expectations for student-faculty interaction in online or hybrid courses within their disciplines. Will faculty treat students in online courses differently from their in-person classes? Could that present equity concerns? This may need to be discussed at the level of individual academic programs.

h) Longer-term, as online course offerings expand, members were concerned about the potential for a separate group of faculty eventually emerging to teach online courses, which could introduce issues of equity and other problems.

4. **What kinds of systemwide courses should be created and how should their utility in achieving the UC teaching mission be assessed?**

Members thought that ILTI could be helpful in providing alternative access to high-demand courses (like computer science for non-majors), or some specialty courses or course sequences in which units across campuses may find opportunities to collaborate (for example, special topics environmental science—perhaps coastal biology or wildfires, where multiple campuses have expertise on a topic of special interest to California).

One member was confused as to why ILTI would be less interested in continuing to develop specialty courses since there appears to be high demand. Another was struck by the enormous proportion of students who drop ILTI courses, for reasons that are unclear. Others were concerned about the quality of courses if some could continue to be delivered after the original instructor left using archived lectures and how the Senate could ensure the quality of the courses would be maintained over time, not just as courses are first introduced.

It would be very helpful if the Senate or UCOP could clearly define terms regarding “fully online,” “online,” “remote,” and “hybrid” courses.

5. **What should the ILTI governing structure be?**

ILTI is an Administrative unit, so the Administration can determine what the governing structure of its operations should be. However, ILTI courses and offerings should fall squarely within Senate governance structures and UGC fears this is not currently the case. UCOP can govern ILTI, but Senate bodies should govern courses and academic units should govern how the courses fit into programs.

Thank you.
Katheryn Russ
Chair, Undergraduate Council
February 12, 2021

Mary Gauvain, Chair
Academic Council


Dear Chair Gauvain,

The Irvine Division Senate Cabinet reviewed the *Innovative Learning Technology Initiatives: Recommendations for Future State* report at our meeting on February 2nd. The report was also reviewed by our Council on Educational Policy, Council on Research, Computing, and Libraries, and Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience. Memos from these councils are attached, and a summary of our Cabinet discussion is provided below.

Members reached consensus that ITLI has outlived its usefulness to the campuses and strongly recommend that any resources be redistributed via block grants in the future. This would enable campuses to determine which courses would be most useful to develop and offer online for their students. At UCI, the Division of Teaching Excellence and Innovation provides local instructional design guidance and best practices for online teaching; it is unclear that systemwide services of this kind are still needed. We believe that the ILTI staff would be better utilized working directly with faculty on a campus. There is neither significant student demand nor a budget model to support cross-campus enrollment.

The Irvine Division appreciates the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jeffrey Barrett, Chair
Academic Senate, Irvine Division

Cc: Joanna Ho, Chair Elect-Secretary
    Tony Smith, CEP Chair
    Michele Guindani, CORCL Chair
    Andrea Henderson, CTLSE Chair
    Kate Brigman, Executive Director
    Gina Anzivino, Associate Director
    Michelle Chen, CORCL Analyst
    Julie Kennedy, CTLSE Analyst
January 26, 2021

JEFF BARRETT, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE

RE: SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF THE INNOVATIVE LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE

At its January 7, 2021 meeting, CEP discussed Innovative Learning Technology Initiative assessment report and recommendations for the future. As requested, lead reviewers considered the questions provided when reviewing the report. Responses are provided below:

1. **Given that ILTI courses often have been developed in coordination with individual faculty rather than with campus departments, how can ILTI develop a more appropriate and effective partnership with campuses such that it positively impacts the core teaching mission of the University?**

CEP is concerned that the current portfolio of ILTI courses is idiosyncratic. If ILTI continues, its mission should be refocused to coordinating online course development efforts on the campuses and providing central support via block grants. CEP was concerned to learn that only 40% of the current ILTI budget is currently distributed to campuses.

2. **What is the potential role and impact of ILTI on the core teaching mission of the University?**

The report describes ILTI’s four main activities: online course development, undergraduate student enrollment, non-matriculated student enrollment, and the cross-campus enrollment system. Of these, the only activity CEP would support continuing is incentivizing online course development; this would ideally be done via distribution of block grants to the campuses. No convincing data has been presented to demonstrate sufficient demand to continue the non-matriculated student enrollment and cross-campus enrollment programs. Indeed, some members suggested that ILTI should receive no more funding until they can provide campuses with a report showing the number of students enrolled that have completed courses with a passing grade over the last four years; these reports should be run a year after each cohort to capture retroactive withdrawals.

CEP can envision an impactful role for ILTI in leveraging across campuses to help negotiate for software and eliminate waste, as with the Unizin model. ILTI could also assist with vetting the software for appropriate student data privacy protection to ensure new tools meet UC standards. However, this would be a significant shift away from ILTI’s current activities.

3. **What can the systemwide ILTI program best provide for the campuses: instructional design guidance, best online teaching practices, multicampus instructional innovations, cross-campus enrollment through the CCES platform? Other?**

Please see responses to Questions 1 and 2. UCI’s Division of Teaching...
Excellence and Innovation provides local instructional design guidance and best online teaching practices, so it is unclear that systemwide services of this kind are still needed. There is neither significant student demand nor a budget model to support cross-campus enrollment, and CEP strongly recommends that this program be eliminated. Indeed, some departments at UCI have already decided not to allow cross-campus enrollment due to the administrative challenges presented (including problems with transcripts) and the significant amount of faculty time required for coordination with students. As an alternative to cross-campus enrollment, the Office of the Registrar at each campus can coordinate small group enrollment via the simultaneous enrollment process. If there is truly a need for some kind of cross-campus enrollment system on some campuses, UCOP could give the Registrars a block grant of their own for a build; this would be a better return on investment. CEP would not support expanding the CCES platform.

4. What kinds of systemwide courses should be created and how should their utility in achieving the UC teaching mission be assessed?

CEP was unclear of the material difference between ILTI courses and online courses offered by a single campus but made available to students at other campuses.

It is unclear that there is significant student demand for systemwide online courses. Arguments could be made to offer courses from top-ranked programs or high demand courses that are not available on most campuses. Alternatively, departments across campuses might be encouraged to develop shared courses. The latter might help to address gaps in the undergraduate curriculum presented by retirements in small departments.

5. What should the ILTI governing structure be?

CEP did not have an opinion on ILTI’s governing structure. However, members noted that there have already been multiple changes in both leadership and program title since ILTI’s founding.

In summary, CEP recommends that ILTI be refocused to distribute block grants and work to negotiate software contracts and vet educational software systems on behalf of the campuses. CEP is opposed to continuing business as usual with the current model emphasizing cross campus enrollment.

Sincerely,

Charles Anthony Smith, Chair
Council on Educational Policy

Cc: Kate Brigman, Executive Director, Academic Senate
JEFFREY BARRETT, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE – IRVINE DIVISION

Re: SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW - INNOVATIVE LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE (ILTI)

At its meeting on December 7, 2020, the Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience (CTLSE) discussed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative assessment report and recommendations for the future.

Members had the following comments:

1. The reviewers’ stated investment in producing a recognizable brand in the name “UC Online” prompted concerns that this program would be a step toward an online UC degree, a step to which members would strongly object.

2. One member expressed concern that the decision to direct funding away from specialty courses and toward high-demand courses would make the program less useful for expanding our curricular offerings while encouraging departments to “resolve” faculty staffing problems with a sub-par pedagogical “solution” that would then become entrenched.

3. Members agreed that non-matriculated students should not be included in the program.

4. There was concern that ILTI had no budget plan to cover the expense of hiring T.A.s for larger courses. As it stands, that expense would fall entirely to the host institution.

5. There was a complaint that the CCES can lead to curricular anomalies when departments on one campus are asked to produce “equivalent” or requirement-fulfilling courses to meet the needs of other campuses.

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

Sincerely,

Andrea Henderson, Chair
Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience
February 2, 2021

JEFFREY BARRETT, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE, IRVINE DIVISION

RE: Systemwide Review of Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)


Key findings of the report included the following:

- The non-matriculated program’s success was limited. Low enrollment is due to a combination of ineffective advertising and “brand confusion” with existing programs on various campuses and UC Extension efforts.
- Measures of success regarding current UC students and online programs appear mixed. On the one hand, the percentage of students enrolling in courses was relatively high. On the other hand, the majority of students enrolling did not complete their courses. For example, in the most recent year reported AY2017, 1,364 students enrolled and 834 of these students (61%) did not complete the course. Cross-campus enrollment appeared especially challenging, with some registrars declining enrollment requests.
- A survey of the students suggests that the primary motivation for enrolling is to get GE courses and/or course requirements for the major/graduation out of the way.

The report recommended that the non-matriculated program be eliminated, creation of a new UC Online program with rebranding, and a restructure of administration and governance.

The Council made the following comments:

- To understand the future impact of ILTI/UC Online on the core teaching mission of the University, it will be important to better assess the reasons for high non-completion rates. The review describes a few reasons for non-completion. Some reasons aligned with the core teaching mission while others raise questions about the quality and desirability of ILTI/UC Online courses. There are also coordination issues related to ensuring that campus registrars have approved the courses for credit. These questions take on additional significance given that the widespread adoption of online teaching in the pandemic has emphasized challenges of remote learning for engaging students and delivering high quality instruction.

- This issue of retention and dropout also relates to the question posed by Senate leadership about the types of systemwide courses that should be created. The focus on expanding “innovative” course offerings seems hard to justify in light of the students’ self-reported interest in completing graduation and major requirements.

- Throughout the report, the issue of redundancy at the system level is repeatedly highlighted. The recommendations overall seem aligned with reducing redundancy; however, there is little comment in the report about UC Online’s resources for instructional design and how the administration
will ensure that they are not redundant with campus resources and staff. This is especially the case given that the pandemic has forced campuses to devote significant personnel and resources to online instructions. A question is whether and how instructional design staff within UC Online will coordinate with ongoing instructional design and technology efforts at campuses.

- Considering that the ILTI has access to student records, there is concern about whether enough is being done to ensure student data privacy.

- There is concern regarding administrative overreach. A look at the UC Innovative Learning Technology Initiative site reveals that there are 35 staff members and little faculty presence. Further, the report describes staff who are not part of the IT department who are running this system. It is unclear whether the staff have expertise in the area.

- A consideration of the institutional history of centralized online education at the UC is important. After the 2008 crisis, there were UCOP attempts to shape education at the UC during a period of intense budget cuts. These include the 2013 Yudof/Brown Initiative, UC Online Cross Campus Initiative, and the ILTI. There was a great deal of faculty resistance to the initiative, which was eclipsed by 2015-2016 when CA budgets improved greatly. It is clear that there is no continuity or accountability for the money spent and the initiative's obvious failure to provide quality education or save money.

- UC Irvine, along with UCSF, are the only campuses of the ten that are not using the cross-campus enrollment system for ILTI/UC Online. This system is described in the review as “an almost unheard of feat in American higher education.” The review attributes UC Irvine's challenges as due to “an aging student information system.” This should be an issue of concern for the campus.

- Members criticized the piecemeal nature of the review of proposed policies of online issues. There should be better systemwide coordination to ensure that the policies are appropriately referring to each other.

The Council appreciates the opportunity to comment.

On behalf of the Council,

Michele Guindani, Chair

c:  Kate Brigman, Executive Director
    Gina Anzivino, Assistant Director
    Michelle Chen, CORCL Analyst
    Brandon Haskey-Valerius, Senate Analyst
February 9, 2021

Mary Gauvain
Chair, UC Academic Senate

Re: (Systemwide Senate Review) Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review

Dear Chair Gauvain,

The Divisional Executive Board, councils, and committees appreciate the opportunity to review the proposed revision to (Systemwide Senate Review) Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review.

Executive Board members concurred with the comments expressed in the attached committee statements. After discussion, Executive Board members unanimously endorsed a motion not to approve the proposal as written, to endorse the cross-campus enrollment section, but to transfer all other ILTI operations to the campuses.

Sincerely,

Shane White
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Encl.

Cc: Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, UCLA Academic Senate
    Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
    April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate
January 29, 2021

To: Shane White, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Susan Cochran, Chair
    Committee on Data, Information Technology, and Privacy


At its meeting on January 28, 2021, the Committee on Data, Information Technology, and Privacy (CDITP) reviewed and discussed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review and offered the following for consideration:

Committee members were heartened by the report’s efforts to identify the most appropriate homes for aspects of ILTI’s portfolio. Members were pleased at the plan to move much of the IT management into the ITS group at UCOP where existing expertise is better equipped to meet the IT need of enrollment management. Contract negotiations is likely another task that could be housed in the unit at UCOP that conducts software contractual arrangements for the UC. While ILTI might coordinate the list of desired software, negotiations would likely benefit from leveraging the University’s depth of resources in contract negotiation.

Members also opined that faculty across the UC are now much more familiar and experienced with the intricacies of online education in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. In recognition of this rapid increase in expertise and the emerging expertise on the campuses in constructing online courses, committee members supported the initiative to transfer as much funding and decision-making to the campuses, particularly around course construction, as possible.

Lastly, members noted that it was essential to identify what aspects of ILTI’s role would be coordination versus support for the campuses. Some aspects of UC-wide online presence can benefit from a uniformity of approach. Members noted that key to the success of the program would be the ability of the UC to leverage cutting-edge approaches to online education. Identifying what structure (central, federated, or any other alternative) will achieve that is key.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via the CDITP Analysts, Estrella Arciba/Taylor Lane Daymude, at earciba@senate.ucla.edu/ tlanedaymude@senate.ucla.edu.
January 26, 2021

Shane White, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Systemwide Review: ILTI Review

Dear Chair White,

At its meeting on January 19, 2021, the Faculty Welfare Committee discussed the ILTI Review. Committee members offered the following comments.

Members found this review to offer some recommendations but no concrete proposals. Members pointed out the low completion rates of these online courses, which need to be addressed.

Additionally, members advised against the push for online instruction. In-person classes and online classes differ substantially. The quality of instruction may suffer if fully online, and students suffer as well. Although revenue may increase, quality will inevitably suffer.

If you have any questions, please contact us via the Faculty Welfare Committee’s interim analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at efeller@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Huiying Li, Chair
Faculty Welfare Committee

cc: Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, Academic Senate
    Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Elizabeth Feller, Interim Analyst, Faculty Welfare Committee
    Members of the Faculty Welfare Committee
January 27, 2021

To: Shane White, Chair
Academic Senate


As requested, the Academic Senate Committee on Teaching discussed the ILTI review during our January 12, 2021, meeting. There was a brief but robust discussion. Here are the main points for consideration and concern that emerged in the committee’s discussion:

1. Understanding the timing of reviews like this, there was notably little mention of the pandemic or things that had emerged during the forced movement into widespread online teaching that might help inform how best to move forward. What role did these courses play in delivery during the pandemic?
2. The committee agreed that earmarked funding for the initiative is important and ensuring that it is the campuses who have the resources to implement and improve online teaching through this initiative. However, campus buy-in is important. How big is the appetite for this project more generally?
3. Faculty expressed concern over the low completion rates. At UCLA the registration process requires a number of steps that delay start dates and can put students behind before they even begin the coursework, perhaps contributing to the completion problem. Streamlining this and making it more accessible across campus would facilitate the program and its utility.
4. Faculty endorsed the name change, but were confused about the specific rebranding of UConline.
5. Efforts to implement more of this program (or other online teaching) must be accompanied by universities determining what they will count toward their degree programs. When we move to more hybrid programs post-pandemic, what will it mean for students and for faculty as far as expectations go in teaching in-persona and online.
6. What role do faculty play in this review and in working together to implement changes that come from it?

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this review. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at collett@soc.ucla.edu or the Committee’s analyst Renee Rouzan-Kay at rrouzankay@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Jessica L. Collett, Chair
Committee on Teaching

cc: Shane White, Academic Senate, Chair
Jody Kreiman, Academic Senate, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect
Michael Meranze, Academic Senate, Immediate Past Chair
April de Stefano, Academic Senate, Executive Director
To: Shane White, Chair  
Academic Senate

From: David Gere, Chair  
Committee on Continuing and Community Education

Date: January 26, 2021


At its meeting on January 21, 2021, the Committee on Continuing and Community Education reviewed and discussed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review and offered the following for consideration:

Committee members expressed concerns regarding the administration and funding of UC Online. Rather than a centralized approach, members felt that funding and administration of online courses are best governed at the campus level to maintain quality control on the content. Members recommend that funding be directed to individual campuses for investment in IT support and infrastructure to build out hybrid and online courses and to support faculty with course development.

Student members, in particular, felt that more students at UCLA would make use of UC Online if the campus developed a mechanism for impacted courses to be offered in an online format.

Members were surprised by the low completion rate and recommended that UC Online work harder to support student achievement and degree completion.

Members were generally supportive of Recommendation 1: Eliminate the Non-Matriculated Student enrollment efforts previously branded as UC Online as there does not seem to be demand and because the cost of the program is prohibitive. One member noted, however, that “non-matriculated students” sometimes includes international students who need to complete a course in English at a top university in order to demonstrate that they are capable of attending. How might they accomplish this goal if enrollment for non-matriculated students is eliminated?

Lastly, members noted that it was unfortunate that UCLA Extension was not asked to opine separately on the issue as they might have offered valuable insights on online programming. Why were they not consulted?

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via the interim Committee on Continuing and Community Education analyst, Emily Le, at ele@senate.ucla.edu.
January 26, 2021

To: Shane White, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Megan McEvoy, Chair, Undergraduate Council


At its meeting on January 22, 2021, the Undergraduate Council reviewed the Systemwide Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review. The Council consulted with its Curriculum Committee, which discussed the Review at their meeting on January 20, 2021.

Members were generally in favor of decentralizing the activities of a centralized administrative entity like ILTI as much as possible, and distributing more funds to campuses. The October 2020 Update notes, “From 2013-2016, ILTI received $10M in annual funding. In 2017, the funding was reduced to $9M. ... ILTI has distributed over 60% of its funding to campuses since inception.” Members recommend that the percentage of funding going to campuses be substantially increased, particularly in light of the Review’s recommendation that centralized administration and governance be restructured to streamline and reduce administrative burden. Some Council members attested to the quality of local support at UCLA for faculty developing online and hybrid courses from offices such as the Center for the Advancement of Teaching (CAT) and Social Sciences Computing (SSC).

Members expressed concern about the low enrollment rates and the extraordinarily high attrition rates of ILTI cross-campus enrollment courses. As the October 2020 Update notes, “For cross-campus courses, approximately 65% of all initial enrollments are dropped before the end of the add/drop period.” A few members expressed skepticism about the UC undergraduate online enrollment numbers provided in the report, noting that our Registrar’s Office data indicate that fewer than 70 UCLA undergraduates complete cross-campus courses offered by another campus per quarter (Table 1); and fewer than 120 UC (non-UCLA) undergraduates complete cross-campus courses offered by UCLA per quarter (Table 2).

Table 1: UCLA Undergraduate Completion of Cross-Campus Courses by Quarter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>19F</th>
<th>20W</th>
<th>20S</th>
<th>20F</th>
<th>21W*</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCI</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>244</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Because this report was generated during Winter 2021, these numbers represent student enrollment to date, not completed courses.

Prepared by Claire McCluskey, Associate Registrar, UCLA Registrar’s Office (January 26, 2021)
### Table 2: UC (Non-UCLA) Undergraduate Completion of Cross-Campus Courses at UCLA by Quarter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj Area</th>
<th>19F</th>
<th>20W</th>
<th>20S</th>
<th>20F</th>
<th>21W*</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;O SCI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF AMER</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN N EA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMENIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;EE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM HLT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPS SCI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM TV</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLB HLT</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I A STD</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLM ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSCI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL SCI</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCH</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAND</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOL</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAHILI</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEATER</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURKIC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIDDISH</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>366</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Because this report was generated during Winter 2021, these numbers represent student enrollment to date, not completed courses.*

Prepared by Claire McCluskey, Associate Registrar, UCLA Registrar’s Office (January 26, 2021)

Registrar’s Office staff described ILTI as “high effort, low yield”; despite the substantial amount of money that has gone into the Cross-Campus Enrollment System (CCES), enrolling and dropping students and creating visitor records remains a highly manual and time-intensive process for staff. At UCLA, students are required to enroll in 12 units before adding cross-campus enrollment courses, which may be one factor driving the low enrollment rates.

Members felt that UCLA students could potentially benefit from the kind of cross-campus enrollment supported by ILTI. Specifically, cross-campus enrollment could help students enroll in high-demand courses (e.g. foreign language courses, calculus, and writing), which could support students’ timely degree completion. However, as the Review notes, the majority of courses in ILTI’s catalog have been specialty courses that are boutique in nature, rather than high-demand courses (p. 9).
If you have any questions, please contact us via the Undergraduate Council’s analyst, Aileen Liu, at aliu@senate.ucla.edu.

cc: April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
    Aileen Liu, Committee Analyst, Undergraduate Council
    Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    Olga Yokoyama, Vice Chair, Undergraduate Council
December 15, 2020

Shane White, Chair
Academic Senate


Dear Chair White,

At its meeting on December 7, 2020, the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) had an opportunity to review and discuss the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review. Members offered the following comments.

Members raised the issue of governance of online efforts. It appears that the governing committee will be composed mostly of administrators. How will shared governance be implemented? It would be faculty’s purview to initiate and oversee academic programs. Similarly, shared governance in multi-campus academic programs has proven to be a challenge—as demonstrated in the Sacramento Center and UCDC, where members expressed concerns for the longer-term administration of these structures.

Other members suggested that it would be important to look at various models of entities that serve multiple campuses and are administered from a single location. Over time, their activity may evolve and more closely reflect the campus where they are located, instead of the broader system.

Finally, a member suggested reviewing data to establish whether there is continuing student interest in the program. The data included in the document suggest a strikingly low completion rate (see page 12 of the August 2020 ILTI Recommendations document), showing substantial majorities of cross-campus enrolled students failing to complete the course in which they were enrolled.

If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me at groeling@comm.ucla.edu or via the Council’s analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at efeiler@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,
Tim Groeling, Chair
Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Elizabeth Feller, Principal Policy Analyst, Council on Planning and Budget
Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
December 15, 2020

To: Shane White, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Andrea Kasko, Chair
    Graduate Council


At its meeting on December 11, 2020, the Graduate Council reviewed and discussed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review and offered the following for consideration:

Members agreed that there must be direct Senate oversight over the courses offered and a parallel Senate-based governance structure. Senate governance and input is necessary to maintain academic quality and rigor. Separate but related, members also thought it would be important to clarify ownership and copyright of course content.

Members stated that it is important to clarify the role of UCOP versus individual campuses. Given the new budget model, members also expressed that the impact on departmental funding and revenue streams should be further clarified. Members wondered how campus departments would benefit from the initiative.

Members seek clarification on whether union rules for academic student employees will apply.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via the Graduate Council analyst, Estrella Arciba, at earciba@senate.ucla.edu.
February 12, 2021

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair, Academic Council

Re: Innovative Learning Technology Initiatives - Recommendations for Future State

The Merced Division Senate and School Executive Committees were invited to comment on the Report of the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative: Recommendations for Future State.

Comments were received from the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA), the Graduate Council (GC), the Undergraduate Council (UGC) and the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts (SSHA) Executive Committee. All comments are appended for your consideration. A variety of observations were raised by committees, but no committees were opposed. CAPRA requested additional information about the Initiative’s financial ramifications; GC found it challenging to offer a holistic review integrating the information in the October 2020 updates and recommends a thorough consideration of cross-campus enrollment and completion rates. UGC raised some questions related to hybrid courses and the disadvantages faced by UC Merced vis-à-vis online education and teaching. Echoing UGC’s comments, the SSHA Executive Committee suggests that these courses go through departments to ensure synchronization with existing curricula.

At its January 25, 2021 meeting, Divisional Council (DivCo) endorsed forwarding for Academic Council’s consideration all committee comments. Lastly, DivCo notes that with the pandemic, reliance on learning technologies and any future ILTI review could specifically focus more on hybrid learning technologies.

The Merced Division thanks you for the opportunity to review and offer comments on this report.

Sincerely,

Robin DeLugan
Chair, Divisional Council
UC Merced

Cc: DivCo Members
   Hilary Baxter, Systemwide Senate Executive Director
   Michael LaBriola, Systemwide Senate Assistant
   Director UCM Senate Office
January 8, 2021

To: Robin DeLugan, Chair, Division Council

From: Patricia LiWang, Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)

Re: Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review

At its December 15 meeting, CAPRA reviewed the report Innovative Learning Technology Initiatives: Recommendations for Future State. We offer the below comments.

The Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) has the potential to improve the quality of instruction given by the University of California system. The ILTI also has the potential to both increase and/or decrease costs of offering that education. Consistent with CAPRA’s role, this memo focuses on the financial implications, not to belittle the importance of the goals to offer high-quality instruction. The ILTI background materials did not attempt to analyze the financial implications in a way that would facilitate CAPRA’s evaluation.

To comment more substantively about ILTI, CAPRA would need further information on:

- What are the financial ramifications of offering the ILTI program?
- For example, more specifically, under what circumstances does the program decrease costs e.g. when investment in added infrastructure is avoided by offering large classes and/or by being able to reduce the number of classes that are offered by including students from multiple campuses?

If it is helpful to Divisional Council, we attach additional analysis from CAPRA’s lead reviewer.

We appreciate the opportunity to opine.

cc: Senate Office

Encl: 1
Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) – detailed comments by CAPRA lead reviewer.

Starting in 2013, ILTI has provided a funding mechanism and support for online and hybrid courses, operating with a $10M/y budget, reduced to $9M/y in 2017.

This review was initiated in 2018 by UCOP at President Napolitano’s direction.

CAPRA was asked to consider these questions:

i. Given that ILTI courses often have been developed in coordination with individual faculty rather than with campus departments, how can ILTI develop a more appropriate and effective partnership with campuses such that it positively impacts the core teaching mission of the University?

ii. What is the potential role and impact of ILTI on the core teaching mission of the University?

iii. What can the systemwide ILTI program best provide for the campuses: instructional design guidance, best online teaching practices, multi-campus instructional innovations, cross-campus enrollment through the CCES platform? Other?

iv. What kinds of systemwide courses should be created and how should their utility in achieving the UC teaching mission be assessed?

v. What should the ILTI governing structure be?

General comments for discussion or background:

The role of on-line learning has greatly changed during the pandemic. It is appropriate for the current ILTI program to be transformed into a Future UC Online program that will more fully meet the needs of the UC system. The majority of changes proposed are likely to be appropriate, but it would have made more sense to answer the above questions before developing the recommendations. It seems particularly disturbing that a review that took two years and used an outside firm (Huron Consulting) results in an assessment focused only on numbers of courses and students, leaving an assessment of role and value to the reviewing committees without data to use as a basis.

The review does include two bullets about the pedagogical success of the program:

• 10K+ enrolled students surveyed; 4K+ responses received; overall positive
• TA and faculty report positive experiences with ILTI courses

These data were not compared with similar data for “in person” courses.

Similarly, there was no comparison of the cost of instruction for on-line courses relative to in-person courses. There is a general acknowledgement that preparing high-quality on-line course materials requires additional time. There is an implication that financial resources are conserved by offering cross-campus courses and/or by offering larger courses. The provided information makes it difficult to assess where ILTI is providing value for the size of the investment.

The provided material document describes ILTI currently as:

• ILTI is useful for UC Center Sacramento (UCCS) and UC Center Washington (UCDC) programs
• ILTI enables local campuses to offer large courses to their own students
• There is an apparent problem or lack of value with the cross-campus course offerings in that less than half of the students who signed up for a cross-campus on-line course completed the course. Also, the number of students participating cross-campus is small (3,768 in 2019-2020) compared with the total number of students participating in ILTI offerings (39,204 in 2019-2020).
• The use of on-line courses is highly variable across the UC system, with 43% of UC Irving students taking 1+ ILTI courses in 2019-2020 compared with 3% at UC Merced.
• The number of non-matriculated students has been small, so the non-matriculated student program was discontinued in 2019.
• One survey showed that about 1/3 of ILTI-supported courses were for GE credit, while 21% were for their major or minor, smaller numbers were used to meet graduation requirements, prerequisites and other purposes.

The CAPRA lead reviewer sought input from Professor Mike Colvin in SNS. He shared his perspectives:

On-line teaching can be helpful in 3 situations:
1. When a variable pace is helpful to students (relisten to difficult concepts)
2. Being more modular or interactive: provide a few minutes introduction to the first step of an exercise, then the student completes that step before listening to the next instructions. The length of the video can be adjusted to fit the material. Instead of always providing instruction in 1-hour pieces.
3. To enable enrollment when the course might not otherwise be available.

In addition to the notes below, Professor Colvin noted that it would be useful to prioritize offerings based on input from counselors who see students being delayed in graduation because a course is not available that is needed.

Professor Colvin’s written notes/suggestions include:
*I’ve collaborated with Dr. Emily Reed on 2 pre-COVID, ILTI-sponsored online classes: Chem 160 (Intro to Scientific Computing) and BIO180 (Math. Modeling for Biology)
*Both courses continue to be taught up through this semester and at least BIO180 will continue as in an online format
*ILTI is a very good program for getting faculty over the energy barrier to creating fully online classes (especially pre-COVID)
*ILTI could increase its impact in a few ways:
--Coordinate cross-campus communication about what classes would be most in demand
--Organize cross-campus workshops and tutorials on best practices
--Help individual departments at different campuses to include online classes as part of their curricula and/or "ramp-up" courses
--Better communicate different campus calendars, esp between semester- and quarter-based calendars--i.e. 2 of the 6 non-UCM students in my class joined a month late because the assumed we were also on quarters
--Collect data about student outcomes to better "sell" faculty and students on the effectiveness of online learning (which may be complicated by everyone’s experience with non-voluntary remote learning)
Proposed responses to the questions we were asked to address:

i. Given that ILTI courses often have been developed in coordination with individual faculty rather than with campus departments, how can ILTI develop a more appropriate and effective partnership with campuses such that it positively impacts the core teaching mission of the University?

The first step to developing this plan is to evaluate when the on-line courses are adding value. The summary identifies three situations in which ILTI offers courses (innovative, high-demand, and specialty courses). Studying the benefits that ILTI brings along with a break out of how the funding flows would be a first step in identifying appropriate and effective partnerships.

Key actions:

• Ask counselors to identify the courses that are delaying graduation for many students. Identify the best approach to filling these gaps – in some cases a remote class like COVID-type classes might be effective. In other cases the extra cost of an ILTI supported course may be most effective.
• Require all faculty participants to collect data about effectiveness of ILTI compared with conventional and use that data to prioritize further project selection and funding allocations
• Improve communication and/or limit cross-campus enrollment to campuses that have schedules that are aligned (e.g. quarter system campuses only offer courses to students on campuses using the quarter system)

ii. What is the potential role and impact of ILTI on the core teaching mission of the University?

As noted above, this should be studied: For example, the student evaluations of ILTI courses should be compared side-by-side with those from similar non-ILTI courses to identify what types of experiences are found to be most valuable. The costs of offering cross-campus courses should be compared with the cost of offering similar courses at multiple campuses. The strategies should be data driven, but we didn’t find the data in the report.

We believe that the potential role and impact should be:

• Improve the quality of teaching (e.g. by enabling students to listen to the presentation multiple times and by enabling presentation of the material in more effective ways)
• Decrease the time to graduation by ensuring needed courses are available to students in a timely way
• Offer the best quality education with the smallest budget. The ILTI program has the potential to reduce costs, but in most cases it is probably increasing costs.
iii. What can the systemwide ILTI program best provide for the campuses: instructional design guidance, best online teaching practices, multi-campus instructional innovations, cross-campus enrollment through the CCES platform? Other?

The materials noted that 60% of funding flows to campuses, but didn’t include a breakdown of what fraction of that funding is directed to the innovative, high-demand, and specialty courses. It would be useful to identify how the current budget is being spent relative to where the greatest impact is being seen, then use that information to answer the above question.

The above list appears to be a good list, but we believe the following changes could be beneficial:

- There should be an increased focus on assessment to identify the types of courses that are benefiting from the ILTI program
- Communication should be improved in many ways – see some of the notes elsewhere in this summary

iv. What kinds of systemwide courses should be created and how should their utility in achieving the UC teaching mission be assessed?

- Courses that improve the quality of education. (Assessment: Compare outcomes with non-ILTI outcomes including course reviews, students’ preparedness for the following course, and demonstration of the targeted improved knowledge)
- Courses that enable students to access the courses that they are looking for. (Assessment: 1. Evaluate the cost of offering the needed courses through ILTI program relative to adding more sections or offering similar courses at multiple universities. 2. Try to identify the number of students who were able to graduate sooner because of the ILTI offering. 3. Attempt to quantify the benefit to students who would not have been able to take the course without the ILTI offering)

v. What should the ILTI governing structure be?

The ILTI should be led by a faculty member, as is recommended. The recommendation for a new governing council may be appropriate, but should be decided only after answering questions i.-iv.
Graduate Council (GC) has reviewed the report on the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) titled *Innovative Learning Technology Initiative: Recommendations for Future State*, issued in August 2020, as well as the accompanying update prepared in October 2020.

As explained in the cover letter from the Vice President for Graduate and Undergraduate Affairs and Vice Provost for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Yvette Gullatt, that accompanied the review request, the report is based on the review of ILTI that was completed in 2018, and it is supplemented by updates in 2020, in the text of the report as well as informational update that accompanied the review request. GC appreciates the informative update from October 2020 in general, and Appendix A in particular that showcases the progress made from 2013 to 2020.

GC found it challenging, however, to gain a holistic picture of the ITLI’s standing, as it sought to integrate the information from the October 2020 updates into its review of the report. Of special concern was the fact that the update did not include information on the course completion rate in the manner presented in the report. The report, in page 12, presents a year-to-year variance figure, and calls attention to the fact that the completion rate for cross-campus enrollments remained below 40% between AY14 and AY17, and that, as the number of cross-campus enrollment continued to grow, the number of students who did not complete cross-campus courses continued to grow. If this continues to be the case, it requires a thorough consideration of the causes, including a comparison with the completion rate for single-campus online courses, and seek ways for improvement in the completion rate.

Graduate Council appreciates the opportunity to opine.

CC: Graduate Council  
Senate Office

Encl (1)
January 8, 2021

To: Senate Chair DeLugan

From: Undergraduate Council (UGC)

Re: Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review

UGC reviewed the Report of the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI). The review summarizes the strengths of the program in terms of developing online courses, growing enrollment in those courses, and helping faculty successfully implement these courses across campus. While the implementation and growth of the program have been successful, we think looking at the aggregate results (total number of students enrolled, total number of students who complete/pass, etc.) leaves out some key facts that are particularly important to us. Namely, UCM students use ILTI the least (only 3% of enrollees) and have worse rates of completion (only 10-20% actually earn a grade in their ILTI courses) than the average. This situation is, in our opinion, a direct result of the particular disadvantages UCM experiences during online teaching. It is unclear from this review what improvements can be made to address the unique needs of first-generation underserved students.

One possible consideration is the development of hybrid courses. The review makes very little mention of them, but they have the potential to address the shortcomings of online teaching in the case of UCM’s students and is entirely within the ILTI mission. From the review, it is unclear to us how many ILTI courses are hybrid, but at UCM we have at least one: ENGR 190, which Professor Gutierrez designed as a hybrid course precisely with ILTI support. A more detailed discussion of hybrid courses would perhaps help us understand how to make ILTI work for our students at UCM.

Most of the recommendations made in the review are related to streamlining enrollment across campuses, centralizing technical support, and reorganizing the ILTI funding system that supports faculty who develop online or hybrid courses. These recommendations seem generally good. Our only suggestion would be to work more closely with departments (instead of individual faculty) to decide which courses are best suited for the ILTI effort. If these initiatives are organized at the department level, we could better align our efforts to serve the maximum number of students with the least amount of effort.

We thank you for the opportunity to review this item.
4 January 2021

To: Robin DeLugan, Chair, Merced Division

From: Susan Amussen, Chair SSHA Executive Committee

Re: ILTI Review

The SSHA Executive Committee reviewed the ILTI review and proposal for a future state.

We approve of the name change, and we think the focus on supporting the campuses is vitally important. Any course in UC Online should go through the department, to ensure it is tied to existing curriculum.

In terms of proposed roles for UC Online, we see its most significant potential role as coordinating systemwide instructional technology efforts. That means developing shared best practices in online teaching, and standards and guidance for instructional design: if UC Online could help get better prices from vendors through shared purposes, that would be very helpful to the campuses (especially UCM). One thing that would make cross campus registration work better would be not having to learn new technology at a new campus! We also value cross-campus registration, including UC Sacramento, UCDC, and UCEAP. However, we are reluctant to recommend a large expansion of cross-campus online courses at this time. Less than 40% of ILTI’s students registering for a course on another campus completed the course, which does not seem very impressive. Research shows that first generation students, in particular, require individual support that is often missing in online classes and is better provided on campus.

Finally, support for cross-campus enrollment could benefit students not just with online classes, but also with specialized classes taught remotely. These might be niche language classes or specialized methods classes. Such courses would allow more UC students to take advantage of the expertise at other campuses.
Dear UC-M Senate Colleagues:

The School of Engineering Executive Committee appreciates the opportunity to opine on the ILTI Review. We received no comments.

However, should the UC-M Senate request a more in-depth examination, we would be willing to revisit the matter.

Thanks and best regards,

Catherine
(SoE ExComm Chair)
February 16, 2021

Mary Gauvain, Chair, Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

RE: Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review

Dear Chair Gauvain,

The Riverside Division discussed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review proposal and I transmit the comments provided by the Senate committees’ review. The discussion at the Executive Council around the proposal found that the organization and presentation of the report was leading to some confusion regarding the implementation. It was also commented that faculty and student satisfaction metrics or assessment should be better integrated into the reporting in the program. There was confusion about incentives for individual campuses and how these might end up with unintended consequences of inter-campus competition.

Thank you for the chance to comment on the ILTI Review.

Sincerely yours,

Jason Stajich
Professor of Microbiology & Plant Pathology and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Michael LaBriola, Assistant Director of the Academic Senate
    Hilary Baxter, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
    Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of UCR Academic Senate
January 22, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Frederick Wilhelm, Chair
Committee on Academic Freedom

Re: Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review

The UCR Senate Committee on Academic Freedom reviewed the report on the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative. We found the following items of concern:

· Courses taken for UCR credit must be subject to the standard approval practices of the UCR Academic Senate.

· The report states that UC Online will, "Negotiate systemwide contracts for instructional technology systems" (page 25).

In light of recent censorship of academic content by technology companies, it is imperative that these contracts unambiguously specify that the faculty of the University of California has 100% control of all instructional content (see attached memos from the UCR and Systemwide AF committees).
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

December 2, 2020

To: Jason Stajich, Chair  
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Yinsheng Wang, Chair  
Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review

CAP discussed the report from System-wide Review about Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) and concurred with the recommendations made in the report. CAP suggests that the future practice of the UC Online program should also take into account, the impact of instruction in the online format on the teaching evaluations of the faculty teaching these courses, and the ensuing consequences on merit and promotions. From a faculty perspective, the CAP members felt that the UC Online program should also take into consideration, the effect of the UC Online program on faculty workload management.
COMMITTEE ON COURSES

December 16, 2020

To: Jason Stajich, Chair  
Riverside Division

From: Ming Lee Tang, Chair  
Committee on Courses


The Committee on Courses reviewed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiatives (ILTI) Review Report at their December 9, 2020 meeting. The Committee noted these concerns:

- Staffing is inadequate at UCR. Neither UCR’s Xcite nor the Academy of Distinguished Teachers are able to devote resources to expand access to ILTI. UCR does not have the resources in terms of staff or technology to support the program to its full potential. Staff are overwhelmed by the pandemic-induced virtual classes.
- Registration for ILTI courses is extraordinarily cumbersome.
- While ILTI classes at UCR are well-received, they are limited to a small number of classes and therefore any data on ILTI is anecdotal at best.
- Current funding to convert an existing class to ILTI is diminished. Compared to the original grants, current awards reflect a 90% reduction in funding. With zero funds earmarked for online homework, proctoring, etc., it makes the transition exponentially difficult.
- It is challenging for students across the UC campuses to see if classes matriculate across campuses, i.e. if ILTI classes can be considered for credit. For example, UCLA does not have a biochemistry class parallel to UCR’s BCH 100 ILTI offering, thus UCLA students do not enroll in the course. It is also extremely difficult to find out if the same class is considered upper division or lower division across different UCs.
CoDEI reviewed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI): Recommendations for Future State document at our meeting on January 21st. Unfortunately, issues relevant to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) do not appear to have factored substantively in this report. The Committee considers this to be a missed opportunity in several key respects.

The Committee is concerned that the questions that Systemwide Senate Leadership have asked the Divisions and Systemwide Committees to consider do not speak directly to DEI issues. While the Committee acknowledges that DEI is implicit in the "core teaching mission of the University," such a vision is not borne out by the report itself. The Committee encourages all parties involved to pay greater attention to DEI if the report is resubmitted for subsequent review.

The Committee identified three fundamental flaws inherent to the report that are more general and all-encompassing than DEI.

- The proposal lacks clear assessment criteria for the proposed reorganization and rebranding of ILTI along with appropriately designed mechanisms to assess success; DEI should be included in these criteria.

- The proposal fails to address whether or not the ILTI program has been successful in its current incarnation. For example, the Overview section of the report mentions annual funding by the state starting in FY13 "as a means of increasing access and decreasing the time-to-graduate." The report provides data for the numbers of courses offered and the number of students enrolled (Figures 1, 3-5; Appendix II). There is no attempt to define or measure “access” and no data was reported to measure the impact on time-to-graduate for students who enrolled in ILTI courses. It is unclear to the Committee if the ILTI program is presently meeting the State's objectives.

- The proposal fails to assess student and/or instructor satisfaction with their ILTI experience. If there is measurable dissatisfaction, substantially more changes are necessary than the primarily bureaucratic reorganization that has been proposed here.
There is ample opportunity to improve the report and the proposed reorganization that addresses the three concerns outlined above in a manner that seamlessly integrates with DEI.

The Committee was generally concerned that the report lacked a clear DEI component. This Committee would like to offer several specific criticisms and suggestions.

- The proposed ILTI Vision Statement (page 017) does not speak to DEI; this is a missed opportunity.

- The ILTI Future Goals (see Table II, page 018) does not speak directly to DEI. While DEI may be implicit in phrasing such as "campus efforts and priorities" or "activities that support broader systemwide academic priorities," the future goals lack credibility without affirmative goals that are specific to DEI.

- In several places (first, in the Organization Section starting on page 014), the Report mentions that ILTI was moved to a new Department of Graduate, Undergraduate, and Equity Affairs (GUEA), and that the three leaders report to the Vice Provost for Graduate and Undergraduate Affairs / Vice Provost for Equity in Inclusion. No rationale for this reorganization is provided, and whether doing so has positively impacted the evolution of ILTI thus far. This Committee would like to understand more about the Equity component of the GUEA unit, and what the anticipated impact on Equity (as well as Diversity and Inclusion) would be.

- As discussed above, the report provides data for the numbers of courses offered and the number of students enrolled (Figures 1, 3-5; Appendix II), but does not provide any demographic data that can be used to assess the impact of the program on DEI. This directly connects to the “access” objective of the program which was explicitly stated as one of its objectives by the state.
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

December 8, 2020

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Stefano Vidussi, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy


The Committee on Educational Policy reviewed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiatives (ILTI): Recommendations for Future State Report at their December 4, 2020 meeting and engaged in a robust discussion.

The Committee was supportive of decentralizing the ILTI program so that each campus had autonomy for the program on their campus. Additionally, members recommended that campuses establish testing centers to ensure that tests are secure and rigorous.

The Committee was not supportive of the recommendation for UCOP to provide best practices for the instruction of online courses and instead recommends that UCOP defer to faculty for how best instruct their courses.

Concern was noted by the Committee regarding the outdated data included in the report and a recommendation was made to include more up to date findings. Additionally, members noted that the report did not include a representative sample of faculty.

Lastly, members recommended that the review of ILTI be halted until evaluations of the current remote mode of instruction are evaluated.
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

January 26, 2021

To: Jason Stajich  
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Patricia Morton, Chair  
Committee on Faculty Welfare


The Committee on Faculty Welfare met on December 15, 2021 to review the Report on the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review. The Committee notes its approval of the way in which courses created by faculty are being retained. CFW feels it is important to make a distinction between classes currently being taught remotely due to the COVID-19 campus response and those courses that were developed to be taught online. Overall, CFW felt the recommendations in the proposal were very positive and agreed with them.
January 25, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair  
Riverside Division

From: Amanda Lucia, Chair  
Graduate Council


Graduate Council discussed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) report at their January 21, 2021 meeting.

The Council calls for increased and vigilant attention to how online education is integrated, maintained, and supported. The Council was concerned that robust representation from UCR faculty and students was lacking, especially because UCR has valuable contributions regarding equity and access. The report does not include enough of a commitment for staff, which is and will be crucial. It is important that remote teaching due to COVID and online courses designed for remote instruction are distinguishable. The report does not discuss how continued maintenance and updating of the online courses will be handled. The Council also noted that there does not appear to have been adequate consultation with the faculty and graduate students who are and will be teaching these courses (survey responses that would capture pedagogical strategies, student experiences, etc.). The Council appreciated that cross-campus courses will benefit student and faculty access, but also noted that there is distinctiveness to each campus that should be retained.
January 29, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
    Riverside Division

From: Alejandra Dubcovsky, Chair
    Committee on Library and Information Technology


Innovative Learning Technology Initiatives: Recommendations for Future State. This report addresses recommendations for ILTI. It raises issues about enrollment and classes. The one point that seem sound and clear:

1. Eliminate Non-Matriculated Student Enrollment, also known as UC Online, because efforts to enroll non-matriculated students offered little value to the UC system.

The points that raise concerns are:

2. **Recommendation 2: Create a New UC Online Program.** The language surrounding this recommendation is vague. Created mostly pre-COVID, it recommends Online instruction on (1) Innovative Courses, (2) High Demand Courses, and (3) Specialty Courses. These proposals and recommendations were explored and criticized in earlier reports. In other words, these recommendations seemed overly simplistic, and without pedagogical engagement or thought of online teaching issues both in terms of equity and access... which is surprising since in 2020 ILTI was moved to the new department of Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs (GUEA).

Additional concerns within the recommendation (2):

1. The proposal calls to "direct as much funding as possible to the development of online courses..." what does this mean as budget cuts loom? How are faculty and TA’s going to be supported?

2. The proposal calls: "Expanding the use of the cross-campus enrollment system." Again, what does this mean? It makes sense for specialized courses, but can a student take Calculus 1 at Irvine, even though she can take it at UCR. What are the limits of these cross-campus courses?

Finally, **Recommendation 3: Restructure Administration and Governance.** They recommend that a faculty member take-up leadership of the program. But besides that, I was a bit confused about the streamline they were suggesting. It was telling to me that recommendation 3, about governance and structure was as long as recommendation 2 about actual online classes and structure, which (in theory) is the bulk of the proposal.
PLANNING & BUDGET

January 22, 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Katherine Kinney, Chair
Committee on Planning and Budget


The Committee on Planning & Budget discussed ILTI review report at their January 19, 2021 meeting. The cost and revenue of the existing program was not clear to members. The committee was concerned by the noted “limited technical competencies” of the Cross-Campus Enrollments and Operations support structure as a significant problem that would need to be solved. Members raised concerns about how the funding will work for the intra UC program – will revenue go to the campus offering the courses?
January 29, 2021

TO: Jason Stajich, Chair  
Academic Senate

FROM: Philip Brisk, Chair  
BCOE Executive Committee

RE: Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review

Dear Jason,

The BCOE Executive Committee reviewed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review. The Committee is supportive of the portions of the Recommendations for a Future State that seek to streamline the ILTI program; given low enrollment, eliminating the portion presently branded as UCOnline which serves non-matriculated students, makes sense.

While the Committee supports the general sentiment of the ILTI program, the Review fails to provide convincing evidence that the ILTI Program has been successful as currently incarnated, and it is unclear if the proposed reorganization and rebranding will yield a substantive improvement.

A common theme for both the review of the ILTI program’s performance to date and the Recommendations for a Future State aspects of the Review is a lack of clearly defined success criteria, mechanisms to assess success, and feedback processes to refine the program in the event that success is not achieved. The data that is presented focuses on courses offered, students enrolled, and student completion rates; the data is necessary but insufficient, and paints an incomplete picture of the ILTI program and its impact on the core teaching mission of the University:

- The proposal explicitly states that state funding was allocated to both the University of California and California State University Systems “as a means of increasing access and decreasing the time-to-graduate.” Neither access nor impact on time-to-graduate were assessed in this Review, and the Recommendations for a Future State do not indicate any plan to assess them.
- The Review does not assess either the satisfaction of students enrolled in ILTI courses or the instructors who teach the courses; likewise, there is no plan to assess them in the future.
- The Review provides no mechanism or discussion about how quality control is maintained across multiple offerings of the same course by multiple instructors across multiple institutions.

In summary, the Committee feels that ILTI must develop a culture of assessment and accountability to positively impact the core teaching mission of the University, with outcomes shared with Senate leadership.

The Committee suggests that ILTI perform a comparison with comparable statewide systems that provide cross-campus enrollment and online instruction. The Arche program in the State of Georgia was suggested as a well-run system (https://www.atlantahighered.org/).

The Review did not address the funding structure, which makes it difficult to understand the impact on costs and revenue streams. Without loss of generality, if a UCR student enrolls in an ILTI course offered at UCD, presumably UCD bears the cost of course delivery; it is unclear if some fees associated with course enrollment are transferred out of UCR (presuming that the student would otherwise enroll in an equivalent course at UCR) to UCD and/or UCOP. If this is the case, ILTI could pit campuses against one another: each campus is incentivized to enroll as many students as possible from other UCs in the ILTI courses that they
teach, and to minimize the number of its own students that enroll in ILTI courses taught by other campuses. In short, it is not possible to assess the ability for ILTI to develop partnerships with UC campuses without a clear and detailed explanation of revenue streams.

The Committee also noted that there is a general lack of awareness of ILTI among students, faculty, advising staff, and other campus stakeholders. Just as an example, ILTI is not mentioned in the UCR General Catalog, and the section on cross-campus enrollment is brief. UCR is already understaffed, and faculty have a high service load, as they perform functions that are carried out by staff at other UCs that have more equitable funding. This puts the onus on already-stressed faculty and staff to raise awareness of the ILTI possibility, on advisors to guide students through the process of enrolling in ILTI courses, and on the faculty who must approve syllabi. This simply is not sustainable, especially in a time of deep budget cuts.

Lastly, the Committee would like to note that UCR has set up several Committees to review online education in the past. It would be useful to provide the Executive Committees with access to these reports to see how UCR’s internal reviews compare to the ILTI Review. It would also be useful for the Systemwide Senate to review ILTI directly, similar to how UCR internally reviews its own Graduate Programs; a self-review of what is essentially a UCOP program by UCOP is not particularly convincing.
Feb. 1, 2021

TO: Jason Stajich
Chair, Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

FROM: Lucille Chia, Chair
CHASS Executive Committee


As several members of the CHASS Executive Committee emphasized, online teaching will become a definite part of UC’s future teaching and research programs, and “Transitioning from current ILTI to new UC Online seems a right direction.” This memo first addresses questions that the Senate leadership asked:

Given that ILTI courses often have been developed in coordination with individual faculty rather than with campus departments, how can ILTI develop a more appropriate and effective partnership with campuses such that it positively impacts the core teaching mission of the University?

Definitely ILTI needs to develop a systematic approach to collaborating with participating campuses. As the Covid-19 pandemic caused UC campuses to resort to “remote teaching” (after the Spring Quarter 2020 at UCR), some of the problems of online instruction have become more apparent. These include the confusion in the administrative criteria, pedagogical regulations, and legalities for sharing and publishing course contents, all of which should be clarified and standardized system-wide as much as possible. Among the programs that need clear system-wide supervision that are equitable among all campuses is the Cross-Campus Enrollment System (CCES).

What is the potential role and impact of ILTI on the core teaching mission of the University?

The CHASS EC recognizes the inevitability of online teaching becoming a core component of UC’s teaching mission. Thus it is crucial that all stakeholders in the UC teaching mission learn as much as possible from the problems we have encountered in the past ten months of remote teaching. Rather than insistently displaying only progress from
2013 to 2020 of the progress made in the ILTI, it would be far more useful and honest to
discuss the problems we have encountered. One wonders how much of the “progress”
listed in Appendix A in last column (“Now: 2020”) is due to the remote teaching
necessitated by the pandemic. Success has far less to teach us than failures and problems
that need solving.

What can the systemwide ILTI program best provide for the campuses: instructional design
guidance, best online teaching practices, multicampus instructional innovations, cross-campus
enrollment through the CCES platform? Other?

The System-wide ILTI needs to provide all the programs listed. In addition, see the
comments for the next question.

What kinds of systemwide courses should be created and how should their utility in achieving
the UC teaching mission be assessed?

--In looking at the catalog of courses in the CCES platform, there are occasionally the
same or very similar course offered by more than one campus. Will this lead to any
competition or conflict among the campuses? Can information for instructors interested
in offering CCES-qualified course be made more clearly available? And as the new UC
ONLINE is expanded, we need more details about CCES: for example, are there limits of
this program?

--A broader issue: As CCES courses increase, we should ask if the role and function of
each and any UC campus must be defined to clarify the teaching and research tasks as
online teaching becomes such an important part of the teaching mission of UC.

What should the ILTI governing structure be?

The ILTI governing structure MUST consist of representation from each campus from
the following: instructors (primary and teaching assistants), academic advisors, staff from
the academic computer/information technology and the Registrar, and students—
undergraduate and graduate. In other words, all those who have a stake in the teaching
mission of the University. Their voices, however different from each other and however
contentious, must be carefully listened to by the administration on all levels of UC.

Some further, more specific comments on the report are:

1. One point that seem sound and clear: Eliminate Non-Matriculated Student Enrollment,
also known as UC Online, because efforts to enroll non-matriculated students offered little
value to the UC system.

2. Recommendation 2
a. Specialty Courses, the largest portion of courses in the catalog, which were offered in ILTI are not included in the new UC Online. Is there a specific reason? As the new UC ONLINE will be expanding, More details about the CCES are needed—e.g., any limits of this program?

b. Create a New UC Online Program: The language surrounding this recommendation is vague. Created mostly pre-COVID, it recommends Online instruction on (1) Innovative Courses, (2) High Demand Courses, and (3) Specialty Courses. These proposals and recommendations were explored and criticized in earlier reports. In other words, these recommendations seemed overly simplistic, and without pedagogical engagement or thought of online teaching issues both in terms of equity and access... which is surprising since in 2020 ILTI was moved to the new department of Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs (GUEA).

Additional concerns within the recommendation (2):

1. The proposal calls to "direct as much funding as possible to the development of online courses..." what does this mean as budget cuts loom? How are faculty and TA’s going to be supported?

2. The proposal calls: "Expanding the use of the cross-campus enrollment system." Again, what does this mean? It makes sense for specialized courses, but can a student take Calculus 1 at Irvine, even though she can take it at UCR. What are the limits of these cross-campus courses?

   For example, consider the difficulties of courses requiring prerequisites. What if a student has failed math twice and is not allowed to take math on that campus due to failing the course twice (so, now the student has to select another major), will the student be able to take math on another campus? This could be deleterious for the student. Our systems are different on each campus, the student information systems are not linked in any way that I know of. This could cause problems for students who want to follow a path (e.g., BIOL) that they may not be well suited, thereby delaying progress toward graduation because the student does poorly in the coursework. Students can be single-minded at times and won’t give up on a major. In sum, it appears there is much to assess with a move toward online course/program offerings.

3. Specialty Courses, the largest portion of courses in the catalog, which were offered in ILTI are not included in the new UC Online. Is there a specific reason?

Finally, Recommendation 3: Restructure Administration and Governance. The report recommends that a faculty member take-up leadership of the program. But other than that, the streamlining suggested is not clear. It was telling that recommendation 3, about governance and structure was as long as recommendation 2 about actual online classes and structure, which (in theory) is the bulk of the proposal.
Executive Committee

29 January 2021

To: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Theodore Garland, Jr., Chair, Executive Committee
College of Natural and Agricultural Science


The CNAS Executive Committee reviewed this review of the ILTI program and had MANY comments. I am going to sign just below and then list them below my signature. The comments are a mixture of what we discussed in the Executive Committee and feedback that we solicited from individual departments, via their representatives. The order of presentation is somewhat random, and it does not much follow the five questions posed.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Views of the ILTI program varied widely among individual faculty and among departments. Some had essentially never heard of the program whereas others had received grants.

The mission of ILTI seems to have shifted over time. Originally, it seems that ILTI was oriented towards developing online versions of large "gateway" courses that were impacted by large enrollments and that would be useful to have available across campuses. More recently, it seems that grants are given for courses that have no intention of being made available for cross-campus enrollment, and even for some that are not even hybrids, let alone fully online. We saw no explanation for this mission creep, nor any justification for it.
We also noted that changes in the goals of ILTI have not been communicated to faculty who might want to participate. Some were turned off by the initial requirements, and never thought to apply later when requirements may have become more attuned to their needs.

This apparently shifting goals of ILTI had some effects on what people thought of the program, via expectations and experiences.

The Report Review that we were given seemed like something of a whitewash.

We agreed that a lack of coordination at department or program levels was suboptimal.

The report seems to overstate the effectiveness with which the on-line classes they supported have been made available system-wide, both in terms of outreach and mechanics (campus approval, cross-campus enrolling). Our experience is that this has not been done effectively. It appears that only a few hundred students a year enroll through the $13M CCES and complete their course. That is the size of one large gateway class at one campus in one quarter.

Some grant recipients noted continuing trouble with getting cross-campus students enrolled. This seems to occur EVERY quarter, even in courses that have been going for years. Why can’t the folks up north get their act together?

A lack of consistency in the software systems and procedures of the registrars on different campuses is a hindrance to ILTI’s goals.

ILTI has done little or none of the legwork to advertise courses across other campuses and, perhaps even more importantly, they have not worked to get courses articulated across campuses. This is a huge impediment that must be dealt with directly by ILTI, not individual instructors.

There is also the feeling that this centralized program has been less effective than campus-based learning technology programs at supporting the development of on-line classes.

Some thought that most (more than the recommended 60%) of the funding
should go to the campuses through block grants. The Systemwide Competition seems to have had limited successful thus far, and we would not expect that to change in the future.

We agree that a better role for this UCOP office might be coordinating systemwide instructional technology efforts – by taking some of the burden off the campuses (e.g., negotiating systemwide licensing), not by creating more work for them (imposing best practices that are unfunded mandates).

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM INDIVIDUAL FACULTY FOLLOW:

Note that some faculty found it difficult to differentiate opinions between ILTI per se, which provides funds with varying amounts of strings attached, and the local UCR resources (e.g., our learning technologists, now called XCITE) who help them (spend the money).

Well, in regards to supporting the development of online classes in general, I think it has been effective. The program has certainly given me more than adequate resources to develop high quality online learning materials. However, my understanding is the program was intended to create courses that could be taken by students from across the UC system. My sense is that it has not achieved that goal. Part of the problem lies in the fact many institutions created duplicate courses (e.g., UC Irvine created an online prep chem course, so why would their students bother to take mine?). Beyond that, you then need to get buy-in from departments at other campuses to endorse/promote courses created by someone else, and I think that is rare (if it happens at all). I had a colleague at UCLA who tried to get her department to have their students take my prep chem course, but they never did endorse the idea and I got no more than a dozen or so students from their camps to take my course.

I think the program does a good job of supporting development of online materials, but the problem is getting students from other campuses to take our classes. In-person lab requirements are a limitation for STEM classes. Not sure if this is related to online classes/ILTI courses, but other UCs also don't seem to accept transfer credit from UCR without a lot of hoops to jump through. Their emphasis with time has moved to strictly online courses;
which limits what we can do. Though with the transition to emergency remote instruction I wonder if students will be more interested in online learning in the future... how does UCOP leverage that?

I heard the campus stopped getting the license for Playposit. My colleague wrote: "they extended the license until the end of the [Fall 2020] quarter. Afterwards, I will be able to use my bulbs, but only if I move videos into YouTube and relink them. Also, I will lose BlackBoard integration and if I want to share it with students, I will need to pay them $144/year for a professional license (the free license limits the number of students that can use bulbs).

The offering should be in coordination with local department needs and development. I also am concerned whether the last question regarding the governing structure is the beginning of a discussion on a virtual campus.

The courses I developed with my ILTI grant (for Math 6A/6B) are courses that I also designed for in person classes and I coordinate all 6A/6B sections. Given that I coordinate the courses already, developing the sequence with me for the ILTI was essentially developing it with the department. Similarly, other coordinated courses/sequences potentially could then be (and certainly some are) developed with more impact than an individual faculty member’s courses.

Pro+Mixed: The funding was very helpful in getting some time to develop a way to transition courses to a hybrid/online environment as well as to purchase necessary technology for this transition. Reflecting upon my application, I wish I had applied for more money for me and those in my department to develop the materials as this was a much more significant time investment than I anticipated. While theoretically money can be transferred between different categories in the grant, I have been told that doing so would likely reduce the overall grant funding and so have not investigated that further.

Pro: I am very glad that I had already spent significant time developing 6A/B
to be hybrid before the pandemic as I was able to smoothly transition the
courses for me and all the sequence (6A/B) instructors to the online
interface at the start of the pandemic.

Con: Several times the recommended tools (such as those used for video
hosting) by ILTI technologists to use to share with students changed, which
then caused extra work if those tools were used. Choosing tools more
carefully and sticking with them would make them more usable. Especially
choosing ones that faculty can expect to have access to indefinitely. I
was concerned about this issue and chose not to use those tools -- instead I
used ones associated to my UCR Gmail account so that I would not
encounter this issue that I correctly was concerned about.

Pro: The technology staff who helped me set up the green screen and select
technology for creating my own videos were very helpful. Setting up a
usable green screen lab was more cost effective than having a UCR
videographer film and edit the videos.

There are good and bad things to be said. As a matter of fact, most of what
I have to say is about XCITE (the service on campus that, among other
things, is supposed to help people with ILTI grants do their ILTI-funded
projects).

ILTI provides funding for developing but once you are done developing, it is
the campus that is supposed to sustain whatever you developed. As you
can imagine, a big portion of the funding goes to XCITE. I was able to cut
that down significantly because I do my own video editing (it is quicker than
verifying everything edited by people who do not understand the material),
and YouTube now does an excellent job generating closed captions (they
are no worse than close captions produced by "professionals"; they need to
be edited by so are human-generated ones). So, basically, the only thing I
need from XCITE is the filming studio.

But even that can be a disaster sometimes. In Summer 2019 we were
filming for MATH131. The workflow we used for MATH011 was that I would
get the raw footage within a couple of days after filming and would go over it
to make sure that everything was fine and nothing needed to be retaken.
This time they gave me the footage more than a month after we were done
filming. It turned out that 70% of what we filmed was recorded without
sound. That is, the student employed by XCITE verified that he can hear us in the headphones, but did not verify that the sound was actually being recorded. So, essentially we will have to redo all that again.

AES faculty generally do not have time to generate system-wide courses. There is a difference between appointments in AES and not in AES. Administration wants all faculty to think that all faculty positions in the college are created equally but that is not correct. There is a difference for faculty members truly working in agriculture and dealing with commodities (state national, international), federal programs (like IR-4), state and federal regulators (DPR, EPA), USDA, NSF etc. grant proposals, and reviews etc. as well as already fulfilling teaching responsibilities in split appoints between OR and I&R.

Online courses are not how to teach plant pathology or any biology class. In the last year, many faculty members experienced first-hand teaching upper division biology classes that use microscopes and dissecting scopes through zoom. It is a difficult task that results in poor training of students.

The forms need to be more clear about the incentives. Most faculty would view this like a grant proposal and want to know the extent of funding involved. In the attached documents it was difficult to find this information. The program needs to have a broader perspective on the different types of faculty, ways to motivate faculty in different departments and disciplines, and generally more creative or open.

I interacted very little with the UCOP/ILTI people but used the resources to pay for consulting with the Learning Center at UCR, for some equipment that I used to make the videos, and summer salary support for updating content. As part of the terms of the grant we have to offer cross-campus enrollment in our course for at least five years during the normal term (if memory serves). The grant application process was straightforward enough. My understanding is that in recent years they are allocating less money for
It’s helped me a lot to improve my CBNS 124 course. It provided money for instructional designers (IDs) that helped with all kinds of tasks: filming my live presentations, editing and captioning video lectures I made on power point using Camtasia, using special programs like Play posit to embed questions into video lectures and syncing with gradebook (there were problems). They also helped with creating exams online, using/troubleshooting CANVAS, etc. One of IDs also helped create clinical correlate mini-lectures as well which improved the course. Finally, we are working on making mini-experiments held in discussion fully online. Work in progress.

The ILTI program is excellent overall, should be continued and expanded, but it certainly is not perfect. Here are some comments below.
1. The financial impact cannot be understated. I had the luxury of paying for GSRs to help develop the course, paying Instructional Designers to help use best practices, paying (someone) for recording time on high-demand equipment. ... This type of funding makes creating high-quality online education much easier.
2. There’s no formal campus support to help manage a substantial operation, at least in my case with two high-enrollment courses.
3. The cross-campus enrollment process has been problematic this quarter.
4. There are not enough Instructional Designers and recording equipment across campus. This became more apparent when everyone needed help moving to online instruction.
5. Having an ILTI helped me better teach all my courses online during the pandemic. I also felt like sharing some of my experiences was valuable to the rest of the department and broader college as part of a 'CNAS Remote Instruction Workgroup'.
6. Mainly because of the pandemic, we are trying to do too much too quickly. As a result technology tools my ILTI was counting on have been turned off in favor of newer (better?) tools. This can cause massive disruptions when everything is delivered online. Some tools have also not been fully vetted (or are overwhelmed).
February 17, 2021

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Susannah Scott, Chair
      Santa Barbara Division


The Santa Barbara Division distributed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) report to the Undergraduate Council (UgC), Committee on Courses and General Education (CCGE), Council on Planning and Budget (CPB), Committee on Diversity and Equity (CDE), Committee on Information Technology (CIT), Committee on International Education (CIE), Graduate Council (GC), and the Faculty Executive Committees of the College of Engineering (ENGR) and the College of Letters and Science (L&S). Each individual response is attached for your consideration.

Multiple responding groups acknowledge the new reality of online instruction following the past year of teaching and learning remotely. As CPB states, “every aspect of the report demands rethinking in light of everything we have learned about the challenges and opportunities of online learning from our abrupt transition into virtual teaching.” Other groups (CIT, CCGE) call for further assessment of online learning in general, with CIT noting that the “motivation for online instruction must be pedagogical” and that “any expansion of online teaching should be based on the course’s ability to successfully deliver its stated learning outcomes.” The low completion rate of ILTI courses is an area of related concern; several groups pointed out the lack of contextual information to accompany the data provided in the report and recommended further analysis.

The councils and committees also call attention to issues with systems integration, coordination, instructional support, and the funding and business models for the program. These are all significant areas in need of examination and consideration, and are key to the success of ILTI. Additional Senate faculty involvement in the governance of ILTI is strongly recommended, particularly as the Initiative navigates this period of repositioning.

We thank you for the opportunity to opine.
To: Susannah Scott, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Mary Betsy Brenner, Chair
   Undergraduate Council

Re: Innovative Learning Technology Initiative - Recommendations for Future State

The Undergraduate Council (UgC) has considered the report on the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI), which focuses on the program’s current activities and services and makes recommendations for repositioning the program.

Some members expressed support for the elimination of non-matriculated student participation due to the lack of overall interest in the program from this prospective population. They attributed the lack of interest to high costs and the nonexistence of a path to earning a degree through the program. It was also noted that it was common for this population to lack the necessary course preparation. However, other members felt that UC could be giving up on a potentially significant revenue-generating opportunity. They argued that the demand and interest in online courses could greatly increase due to the national shift to remote instruction.

The Council also noted that much of the information included in the report was gathered prior to the pandemic, and is therefore outdated. Both student and faculty opinions regarding online courses may have shifted after taking part in fully remote instruction over the past year. Also, lessons learned during the pandemic can be applied to the ILTI program in order to provide a better experience.

The report indicates that each year the proportion of students who do not complete the courses is larger than the proportion who do complete. UgC found this statement troubling, and recommended further investigation about the reasons students do not complete the courses. Is this a pattern at all campuses? Is there any interaction with campus policies on ILTI course enrollment?

UgC generally supported the recommendation to increase the amount and proportion of funds distributed to the campuses by minimizing internal costs within the UC Office of the President. Members indicated that a shift of resources to the campuses has already begun to take place, which allows campuses to prioritize their online learning needs. The Council recognized the significant resources required to design and offer well-structured online courses, in terms of faculty time, design assistance, and TA support if the campus is to accept larger numbers of students. The latter is not provided by the ILTI program, to our understanding and would need to be committed at the campus level.
UgC voiced support for rebranding ILTI to a name that is more permanent and recognizable to stakeholders, although members were unable to reach a definitive decision on what it should be called. With regard to the recommendation to repurpose “UC Online,” the Committee wonders whether there is a stigma or positive feeling elicited by the name. Will the public assume the program is something that it is not? To some members, it seemed to suggest that it is a stand-alone entity where the public would be able to enroll and work toward a UC degree. The Council emphasized the need for further review of the proposed program name.

With respect to ILTI’s leadership and organizational structure, UgC supported a larger governing board with more Academic Senate participation and a diverse faculty voice. The Council felt that ILTI should continue to focus on innovative and research-based programming, and that central program staff could assist campuses by providing guidance on nationwide trends and best practices in online course design.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director
To: Susannah Scott, Chair  
Academic Senate

From: W. Davies King, Chair  
Committee on Courses and General Education


The Committee on Courses and General Education (CCGE) has considered the report on the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI), which focuses on the program’s current activities and services and makes recommendations for repositioning the program.

Committee members collectively expressed concern about the vast disconnect between ILTI and the campuses. A lack of systems integration and poor coordination has led to what was described as a “logistical nightmare” for students and staff in course enrollment, articulation, and awarding of credit. These processes are cumbersome, and require manual workarounds for actions as simple as adding a course to a student’s registration record, which should logically be seamless given that all ILTI courses are UC courses.

The Committee found the data regarding the number of students who fail to complete the courses they enroll in to be troubling, though potentially misleading. Did the total include both students who dropped the course due to enrollment issues (e.g. unmet prerequisites) at the beginning of the term, as well as those who participated but subsequently failed to complete the course? CCGE recommends that ILTI delve deeper into the reasons for these numbers, in order to identify areas for evaluation and improvement. The Committee suspects that confusion about prerequisites and other aspects of enrollment would have been a contributing factor. A mismatch between campuses on the quarter system and the semester system has also created difficulties for students that impact their financial aid qualifications.

CCGE members noted the relatively small participation of UCSB in the creation and utilization of ILTI courses and wondered what could be the cause of that. Much time and effort is required to create a robust, well-designed online course, one that will match the standard of efficacy of existing face-to-face courses. CCGE maintains a rigorous process of review for online courses developed on the campus because the evidence in such areas as dropout rate seems troubling in some cases, as the ILTI report confirms. We would like to see a deeper study of this mode of education, especially in terms of how well the students of online courses perform in subsequent courses in the major. An unwise move, in our opinion, would be to streamline the approval of these courses without having done the deeper study.
CCGE can understand that the emphasis in the ILTI report seems to be on the large-scale courses, especially in impacted majors. STEM courses, where there is wide agreement about what are the basics for students to learn in preparation for higher study, seem well-suited for inclusion in ILTI. However, we wish to stress that it is more difficult to find consensus on what belongs in the curriculum of introductory courses in the social sciences and the humanities and fine arts. Those divisions benefit from a diversity of approaches taken among the campuses. On the other hand, those divisions benefit greatly from the unique and highly specialized courses that are offered—or could be offered—through the ILTI system. Given that all campuses have taken the half-step (at least) in the direction of remote teaching during the period of the pandemic, this would seem to be an ideal moment to craft ILTI courses in those highly specialized areas.

CCGE agreed with the recommendation to enlarge the steering committee and include additional faculty representatives. The ILTI program would benefit from—indeed, must work toward—additional communication with campus advisors and students in order to build a better-coordinated program that would be more attractive and visible to students.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director
To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair  
UCSB Academic Senate

From: Douglas Steigerwald, Chair  
Council on Planning & Budget

Re: Innovative Learning Technology Initiative

The Council on Planning & Budget (CPB) has reviewed the Proposed Innovative Learning Technology Initiative. The October 2020 update of the 2018 report acknowledges that we are now in a new reality regarding online teaching due to the COVID-19 forced switch to emergency remote instruction. The updated report says that the emergency prompted an early implementation of the funding model recommendations but that the other recommendations require systemwide review and feedback. We feel that the funding model issues are not at all resolved. Every aspect of the report demands rethinking in the light of everything we have learned about the challenges and opportunities of online learning from our abrupt transition into virtual teaching. Admittedly the ILTI recommendations do not address the larger issue of UC’s recent wholesale adoption of private technologies in its dramatic expansion of online teaching and assessment. Instead, the report concentrates on building on the initiative’s qualified successes (supporting online and hybrid course development on the campuses and facilitating cross-campus enrollment) and eliminating the failures (developing non-matriculated student enrollment).

CPB has some particular concerns, especially regarding the need for a more robust funding scheme and viable business model for online teaching/remote instruction. We suggest that the larger picture of what must be done for UC to address online teaching’s challenges and opportunities must be addressed before The UC could take national leadership in the online education space. We outline our concerns as follows:

1) The documentation suggests revenues that are much less than yearly staff costs. It would be good to have some market analysis that predicts how a funding model might sustain ILTI moving forward. We were disappointed to see no comprehensive budget plan that explains the costs and revenues given the proposal’s request for funding. In addition, the stated budget of $10 million has now decreased to 9 million and is expected to decrease further. Who will absorb
these operating costs, and what is the evidence that the program is cost beneficial?

2) Absorbing this within the UCOP seems troubling as this pivots the power structure in favor of UCOP. If 30% of students are enrolling in UC Online moving forward, do campus revenues get reduced in favor of UCOP? Does UCOP begin to compete with campuses for student enrollment? We were concerned that the report did not expressly state how the across campus teaching benefits particular campuses financially.

3) If we facilitate virtual instruction and cross-campus enrollment, shouldn’t we limit the duplication of online courses across campuses? And if cross-enrollment becomes substantial, how is revenue from cross-enrollment allocated?

We also have concerns for a more explicit policy for the ownership of the instructional content. Our questions related to this issue fall into several categories:

1.) Course logistics and support: Who coordinates the faculty teachings evaluations and provides the financial and logistic support for the courses, including managing teaching evaluations and TA allocation and preparation? Who administers the exams? How does the logistics and support model compare to other existing online learning models?

2.) Student support: Who supports student learning while students are in online courses, particularly with respect to Title IX, disciplinary actions, and ADA issues that concern both faculty and students?

3.) Academic credit: Courses must have evaluation mechanisms such as exams. If exams are conducted remotely, how will ILTI handle the safety and security of students given the challenges experienced with surveillance-based platforms, including ProctorU?

4.) Faculty control of course content: How can UC ensure that faculty and not private technology platforms determine course content in light of recent acts of corporate censorship of public university classes by Zoom, for example?

5.) Quality of teaching and academic experience: What about the quality of the teaching and the learning experience that ILTI students are experiencing?

In sum, we suggest that a fuller budget be presented so that CPB can more fully weigh in on the educational and budget model. We want to learn more about the newly constituted online remote learning initiatives with respect to the Innovative Learning Technology Initiatives before a full review of these initiatives alone could take place.

cc: Shasta Delp, Academic Senate Executive Director
January 29, 2021

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Melissa L. Morgan, Chair
      Committee on Diversity and Equity

Re: Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) - Recommendations for Future State

The Committee on Diversity and Equity (CDE) reviewed the Innovative Learning Technology (ILIT) - Recommendations for Future State report at its meeting of January 11, 2021. Members felt that it was ironic to be reviewing this report now, as we are discovering how problematic online learning can be, especially for students who do not have access to the necessary resources. Faculty have had to move online quickly without time for a lot of thoughtful consideration, training, and evaluation of what works and does not. What is learned during this time of remote teaching and learning should be applied to a future model of online education.

Members were generally reluctant to support offering high-demand courses through the online platform, as there is no substitute for in-person instruction for large, introductory courses. Smaller sections, which are an important component of many large courses, would potentially be missed in online learning. This may inadvertently impact first generation students and those with less university experience and well-developed study skills. CDE thought that data should be presented on the quality of the courses being offered. The committee also wondered if any teaching-technology faculty were consulted in the development of this document.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
February 11, 2021

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair
   Academic Senate

From: James Frew, Chair
       Committee on Information Technology

Re: Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) - Recommendations for Future State

The Committee on Information Technology reviewed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) - Recommendations for Future State at its meeting on January 29, 2021. The members offered the following observations and questions:

- Online instruction has changed a lot since ILTI began in 2013; the members agree this initiative is ripe for reorganization.

- Innovation in online instruction is happening bottom-up, particularly in light of the pandemic forcing faculty to adapt their materials for remote learning. The committee therefore questions whether systemwide block grants are still the best way to support these efforts.

- The committee is concerned by the apparent assumption that online learning is better or even cheaper. They feel strongly that the motivation for online instruction must be pedagogical (better teaching), not fiscal (presumed savings). Along these lines, the committee members noted a need for better assessment of online courses than merely the percentage of students that completed the course (although those numbers are not exactly a resounding endorsement). For example: how well do students perform in courses for which they took the prerequisite online? Are the online classes successfully laying a foundation for future learning? Any expansion of online teaching should be based on the course’s ability to successfully deliver its stated learning outcomes.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
January 15, 2021

To: Susannah Scott  
Divisional Chair, Academic Senate

From: Erika Felix, Chair  
Committee on International Education

Re: CIE Response to the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative

The Committee on International Education (CIE) has reviewed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) - Recommendations for Future State report. The committee is supportive of the recommendations to streamline the existing online education infrastructure and to create a new UC Online. We appreciate the attention to international students in the memo and recommendations.

The recommendation to create a new UC Online to Manage Cross-Campus Enrollments and Operations (CCES) has a benefit to all undergraduate students, but may also be appreciated especially by international students. International students must navigate a lot of systems, and the manual entry of grades with the delay that may cause can affect their visa status (see point on p.22). Thus, a streamlined system can have added benefits to international students.

Please do not hesitate to contact the committee if you have additional questions.

Cc: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
January 29, 2021

To: Susannah Scott, Divisional Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Tamara Afifi, Chair
      Graduate Council

Re: Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) - Recommendations for Future State

Graduate Council (GC) reviewed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) - Recommendations for Future State report at its meeting of January 11, 2021. The Council was concerned that the report did not mention graduate courses at all. Traditionally, UCSB has pushed back against online learning, and has never offered a graduate course through ILTI. However, GC also sees how it could be used as an innovative form of learning, across the UC or with other universities. For example, one GC member talked about how it could be used as a “capstone” course in a graduate program where students are able to connect with the best scholars in the world about their area of specialization. How would graduate courses be offered through the ILTI platform? Support, coordination and budget for TAs for undergraduate courses taught online needs to be explained in more detail. The Council was also troubled that the role of mentoring was not discussed.

CC: Shasta Delp, Executive Director, Academic Senate
February 2, 2021

TO:         Susannah Scott  
            Divisional Chair, Academic Senate  

FROM:      Pradeep Sen, Chair  
            College of Engineering, Faculty Executive Committee  


The College of Engineering FEC met on Tuesday, February 2, 2021 and reviewed the report. The committee agreed the bulk of the report addresses structural organization changes and a name change that appear well thought-out and ultimately positive changes for the program.

It was commented that the report identifies that ILTI courses have a low completion rate but the report does not address this issue further. Additionally, some of our committee members were unaware of the program.
December 10, 2020

To: Susannah Scott  
   Chair, Divisional Academic Senate

From: Sabine Frühstück  
   Chair, L&S Faculty Executive Committee

Re: Innovative Learning Technology Initiative: Recommendations for Future State

At its meeting on December 3, 2020, the Faculty Executive Committee of the College of Letters and Science (FEC) reviewed recommendations to adjust the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI), a UC Office of the President initiative to support the development of systemwide online courses.

The FEC agreed that going forward, Senate faculty members should be involved in the decision-making process. Additionally, the FEC recommends that should centralized funds continue to be available, they be used to develop a robust evaluation process for online courses that could be shared with campuses.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

cc: Pierre Wiltzius, Executive Dean of the College and Dean of Science  
   Jeffrey Stopple, Associate Vice Chancellor and Dean of Undergraduate Education  
   Charlie Hale, Dean of Social Sciences  
   Mary Hancock, Acting Dean of Humanities and Fine Arts
February 17, 2021

MARY GUAVAIN, Chair
Academic Council

Re: Review of Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Report

Dear Mary,

The Santa Cruz division of the Academic Senate has completed its review of the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Report the Committees on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD), Academic Freedom (CAF), Educational Policy (CEP), Information Technology (CIT), Teaching (COT), Planning and Budget (CPB), and Privilege and Tenure (P&T), have responded. The responses were varied and nuanced in their assessment of the recommendations proposed in the report. What follows is a brief overview of some of the areas where there was overlap. The responses are enclosed hereto.

Funding
CAAD, CAF, and CEP commented on the recommendations the report made regarding funding for ILTI. CAAD voiced appreciation for the increase in funding but urged caution in how the funds are dispersed. Specifically, CAAD does not want the decentralization of the funding structure to create competition between the divisions. CAF would like to see the proposed goal to simplify the funding structure result in a bifurcated stream: one stream focused on block funding for online education and another established for competitive grants. CEP recognized that UC Santa Cruz has benefited from ILTI awards, and that the financial support in particular has been welcome for supporting faculty and graduate students to develop online and hybrid courses.

Staffing and Technical Support
CPB thought that the report's proposal to appoint leadership with faculty status is a step in the right direction and offered that this should be a UC faculty member with an interest in online learning. On this COT agreed, and went further in recommending that the six-member Steering Committee be expanded to twelve. COT also supports the recommendation that the ILTI should have design and technical support staff to address systemwide issues. Finally, CAAD supported the idea of hiring “an online equity position (i.e. UC Equity Advisor)” to ensure the equity and integrity of UC education.
Though not specifically a staffing issue, CIT and CEP suggested that the ILTI, as situated within the Office of the President, could use this status to help organize systemwide licensing agreements for education technology.

**Senate Authority Over Courses and Curriculum and Academic Freedom**

P&T raised concerns related to the Senate’s authority over courses and curricula as provided under the Standing Orders of the Reagents 105.2.b and APM 015 Part I – Professional Rights of the Faculty, commenting, “Course development through this initiative cannot make an end-run around normal processes of curriculum development established on and for the campuses.” Similarly, CPB observed that the report does not provide a “clearly defined role of the divisional Senates in ensuring uniform oversight of course quality.”

CAF was concerned about how each faculty member will “conceptualize each online class’s intellectual property and copyright in an environment of interchangeable parts.” Relatedly, P&T is concerned about a faculty member’s ability to shape to their own pedagogy within courses created by colleagues through the ILTI initiative and wonders if faculty will be “forced” to teach courses designed by other faculty members.

All of these issues, P&T suggested, could lead to an increase in faculty grievances, and possibly, disciplinary actions.

**Enrollment Issues**

CEP observed that the cross-campus enrollment system is rife with problems that can undermine the potential value of online education, a point on which CAAD concurs. COT expanded on this by noting that every quarter there are many students who attempt to enroll in UCSC online courses but are unable to do so due to a lag time in course approval by their home campuses and in the granting of access to course materials. Like CEP and CAAD, COT urged that it is essential that the cross-campus enrollment system be “substantially improved.”

COT, as well, commented that expanding the use of the Cross-Campus Enrollment System to other suitable campus programs seems like a good idea but that it should be done only if doing so would help students *participate* in those programs (emphasis added).

Several of the committees wished to emphasize that whatever shape the ILTI takes, it should hold the interests of UC students at its center.

In closing I would like to acknowledge that this review is further indicia of the peculiar context of the present climate in which we find ourselves. It is my hope that these comments will assist in creating a more clearly marked path forward.

Sincerely,

David Brundage, Chair
Santa Cruz Division of the Academic Senate

Enc: CAAD to ASC Brundage Re: ILTI Review – 02-08-2021
CAF to ASC Brundage Re: Systemwide ILTI Review and Rec - 02-10-2021
CEP to ASC Brundage Re: Systemwide ILTI Report – 01-21-21
CIT Re: ILTI Report Recommendations - 02-02-2021
COT to ASC Brundage Re: Systemwide Review of ILTI – 02-08-2021
CPB Re: ILTI Report - 02-09-2021
P&T to ASC Brundage Re: ILTI Review – 02-12-2021

cc: Sylvanna Falcon, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
Minghui Hu, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom
Tracy Larrabee, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy
Brent Haddad, Chair, Committee on Information Technology
Maureen Callanan, Chair, Committee on Teaching
Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
Julie Guthman, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure
David Smith, Chair, Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid
Yat Li, Chair, Committee on Courses of Instruction
Ken Pedrotti, Chair, Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections
Nico Orlandi, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare
Senate Executive Committee
February 8, 2021

David Brundage, Chair
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

Re: Systemwide Review of Innovative Learning Technology Initiative

Dear David,

The Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) has reviewed the assessment report of Innovative Learning Technology (ILTI). We reviewed the recommendations and are drawing your attention to the ones in which we have some concerns.

With regards to the recommendation of increasing funds to the campus and minimizing costs to the UC Office of the President, our concern remains with capacity. Does our campus have the capacity to maximize the use of these funds? Is there a more effective method of delivery that underscores the partnership between campuses and central? Our preference would be for a balance, wherein campuses are not left to fend for themselves and that the UC Office of the President provides the infrastructure and support to be successful. Further, we would discourage “systemwide competitions” for funding due to capacity and bandwidth issues, especially at this time. Is it possible to offer an equitable distribution or rotation of funds instead?

With regards to cross-campus enrollment, we concur with the January 21st letter from the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) that there have been structural problems with cross-campus enrollment, leading to understandable frustration for students, staff, and instructors. We would like to be especially mindful of unintentionally creating a workload burden and weakening of course integrity.

Finally, as CAAD, we want to reiterate our concerns reflected in previous correspondence that ensuring equity and integrity of UC education, even in the online format, remain a top priority. Sometimes the focus on budgets and where to save money under the guise of efficiency actually compromises equity at a time when the University of California seeks to recruit under-represented students. We would support and encourage discussions for hiring an online education equity position (i.e., UC Online Equity Advisor).

Thank you for an opportunity to offer our review.

Sincerely,

Sylvanna Falcón, Chair
Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
cc: Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
Minghui Hu, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom
David Smith, Chair, Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid
Tracy Larrabee, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy
Yat Li, Chair, Committee on Courses of Instruction
Brent Haddad, Chair, Committee on Information Technology
Maureen Callanan, Chair, Committee on Teaching
Julie Guthman, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure
Ken Pedrotti, Chair, Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections
Nico Orlandi, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare
Senate Executive Committee
February 10, 2021

David Brundage, Chair
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division


Dear David,

The Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF) has reviewed the assessment report and recommendation for the future of the Innovative Learning Technology (ILTI). CAF would like to comment on the following two aspects of the reorganization and future of ILTI.

1. The campus leadership has identified online education as a critical effort as it moves forward to a post-pandemic future. CAF likes to endorse the proposed goal to simplify the funding streams to two basic categories, including a block grant and a systemwide competition. Such a simplification, especially a block funding for online education, would give our campus more freedom to plan for what we need and what we want to teach. We welcome such an effort to enhance our academic freedom in teaching as we move on to the more online educational platform in the post-pandemic future. We also like to suggest the new online education unit in UCOP focuses less on compliance and format of online courses. The department personnel process and the senate committees routinely include reviewing our classes' quality and teaching performance. Our campus will undoubtedly extend such an effort to all online courses soon. To protect our academic freedom in terms of what courses we teach, we applaud UCOP's efforts to let individual campuses select and plan the course offerings with block funding. CAF also believes that more campus autonomy in online education should be the way to move forward.

2. The rapid advances in Information technology have changed the infrastructure and tools we deploy for teaching. The technological advancement also allows us to make our courses more transferable to our graduate students or junior faculty members to teach. It also allows many components of our online courses to be more interchangeable and standardized, such as many modules in entry-level statistics and writing courses. CAF is concerned with how each faculty member would conceptualize each class's intellectual property and copyright in such an environment of more interchangeable parts and portable online courses.

More subtly and profoundly, such technological change could dissolve what we consider academic freedom of teaching. CAF wants to bring this point to our attention. CAF has also seen the campus' effort to reduce team teaching barriers, involving more than one faculty member and graduate students in designing and teaching an individual course. As we move on to online teaching, team teaching could be more common and acceptable. Who owns the class or deserves the credit of designing the class will not be straightforward. In such a case, how do we protect the academic freedom of teaching?

Our committee thanks you for this opportunity to opine on this very important and timely issue.
Sincerely,

Minghui Hu, Chair
Committee on Academic Freedom

cc: Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
Sylvanna Falcón, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
Tracy Larrabee, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy
Yat Li, Chair, Committee on Courses of Instruction
Jin Zhang, Chair, Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
Maureen Callanan, Chair, Committee on Teaching

Dear David,

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has reviewed the assessment report and recommendation for the future of the Innovative Learning Technology (ILTI).

The CEP discussion on ILTI was quite mixed. Members recognize that UC Santa Cruz has benefited from ILTI awards, and that the financial support in particular has been welcome for supporting faculty and graduate students to develop online and hybrid courses.

The cross-campus enrollment system has been rife with problems. It is process-oriented and does a disservice to the students who want to enroll, the teachers who want to teach them, and the administrators who end up enrolling students manually. These are not only workload inefficiencies that must be addressed by the system; they are also significant barriers to cross-campus education that undermine the potential and value of online education.

Additionally, ILTI could better use its status within the Office of the President to organize systemwide licensing agreements for educational technology, rather than trying to centralize academic support personnel who would be more productively employed at the individual campuses.

Ultimately, CEP asserts that, if the UC wants to foster quality online content, support from the Office of the President is necessary, but the committee does not see the current organization of ILTI as prepared to successfully promote such support even with the proposed reorganization.

Sincerely,

Tracy Larrabee, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy

cc: Minghui Hu, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom
    David Smith, Chair, Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid
    Sylvanna Falcón, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
    Yat Li, Chair, Committee on Courses of Instruction
    Brent Haddad, Chair, Committee on Information Technology
    Maureen Callanan, Chair, Committee on Teaching
    Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
February 2, 2021

David Brundage, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Innovative Learning Technology Initiatives (ILTI) Report and Recommendations

Dear David,

During its meetings of December 2, 2020 and January 6, 2021, the Committee on Information Technology (CIT) reviewed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) October 2020 update and future recommendations. In order to gain a better understanding of ILTI and the potential impact of recommendations provided in this review, CIT reached out to UCSC Director of Online Education, Michael Tassio. Director Tassio’s comments and feedback were considered by CIT in its formulation of this response.

Underlying Issue: The Future of Online Teaching

Online education has been a saving grace during the pandemic, enabling students to continue their progress toward degrees while minimizing their risk of contracting and transmitting Covid-19. Prior to the pandemic, the proper role of online teaching in the curriculum was still unresolved. This issue must be fully vetted and not subject to a creeping adoption by way of incremental improvements in technology and accommodations to circumstances. With this important caveat, the general principle the Committee would follow is to make the online learning experience as excellent and seamless as possible for students.

Focus on the Student Experience

The student experience of enrollment and acquiring appropriate course credit can be excruciating. This is an issue the central UC Online resources must be able to address and improve upon. Whatever the future configuration of UC Online, it must be able to take on and manage the coordination and resolution of issues related to enrollment and course credit.

Resources that enable the process of generating online course content, with its emphasis on screen-
transmitted learning, should be as close to the faculty as possible, which means focusing course-
generation resources on individual campuses. A possible UC Online role could be to work with
the Senate to establish standards and expectations for the student online experience, although
scarce course-development resources should be focused on end-products of courses themselves.

An issue ripe for Senate-Administration consultation involves the identification, adoption, and
facilitation of educational technologies for online learning. UC Online is a likely participant for
the system-wide administrative contribution to this effort, including negotiating systemwide use
licenses for technologies that could be made available to campuses. The challenges of prioritizing,
reviewing, and negotiating agreements in a timely fashion must be taken on and resolved.

Further notes on campus integration of UC Online courses

As noted above, this review of ILTI has the feel of a “cart before the horse” approach since the
larger issue of the role of online education at UC has not been sufficiently advanced. The
Committee raised many questions in this context, which we include here. They include building
understandings about teaching support, course credit, TA support, optimal course enrollment size,
instructor evaluation for online courses, and the overall process for the evaluation of the success
of UC online. Members also raised questions regarding the unclear relationship between system-
wide and single-campus online courses, as well as what happens after a course is created. Will it
always be offered asynchronously, or may be synchronized as well? Unlike in-person courses and
lectures that may be edited and evolve, recorded classes are static. How will these courses be
updated and how does that play into faculty workload expectations? Members also raised concerns
about the possibility of future department FTE being denied if large introductory courses are
covered on UC Online, and the perceived need for local in-person courses is diminished. These
are critical questions that will need to be addressed in order to understand the future of ILTI and
be able to plan for and evaluate the overall future success of UC Online.

Thank you for the opportunity to consult on this topic.

Sincerely,

Brent Haddad, Chair
Committee on Information Technology
cc: Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
    David Smith, Chair, Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid
    Sylvanna Falcón, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
    Maureen Callanan, Chair, Committee on Teaching
    Tracey Larrabee, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy
    Yat Li, Chair, Committee on Courses of Instruction
    Minghui Hu, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom
    Juli Guthman, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure
    Ken Pedrotti, Chair, Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction, and Elections
    Nico Orlandi, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare
    Senate Executive Committee
February 8, 2021

David Brundage, Chair
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division


Dear David,

The Committee on Teaching (COT) has reviewed the report and we agree with Provost Brown's finding that the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) has achieved many of its initial goals. Certainly for UC Santa Cruz, ILTI has provided much needed funding for development and implementation of high-quality online courses. This has provided UCSC with the opportunity to become a leader in online education across the UC system. Rethinking and expanding ILTI's mission at this time also makes sense to us. We agree in general with all of the recommendations outlined in the report, but have some comments on some of the details.

Renaming ILTI to UC Online is a good idea and restructuring its governance structure to have a single faculty director also makes sense to us. A carefully recruited and sufficiently empowered faculty director could play a central role in implementing ILTI's goals, such as supporting and improving online education across the UC system. We support expanding the governing body of ILTI from the current six-member Steering Committee (which includes the three co-directors) to a broader Governing Council of twelve members which should include representation from as many UC campuses as possible. We also support the recommendation that ILTI should have technical support and instructional design staff to develop and provide ongoing support to run online courses as well as help coordinate system wide technology efforts. Such staff can help reduce cost to UC by helping negotiate system wide contracts for instructional technology. Also, one of the strengths of such a team is that they are better situated to support cross-campus efforts than staff on an individual campus. Furthermore, having a centralized support system in designing and running online courses will help make sure that online courses across the UC meet the high-quality standards set out by ILTI. We disagree with the recommendation to align funding for ILTI supported courses to mirror campus funding levels. Proposals should be funded based on merit, including demonstrated commitment to emphasize student learning and experience, as well as documented need, and this should not be subject to local restrictions. In fact, one of the strengths of a centralized funding source and support team is its independence from local campus politics and budgetary constraints.

ILTI should definitely continue and strengthen its efforts to help articulate courses across the UC system as well as streamline the enrollment process. Our understanding is that every quarter there are many students who attempt to enroll in UCSC online courses but are not approved by their home campuses or given access to the course materials until it is too late to realistically take the course. We believe it is essential that the cross-campus enrollment system be substantially improved. This will require considerable resources, and a student-centered approach, but it will be time and money well spent if students across the UC system can develop more confidence in their
ability to take online courses across the UC system. In general, ILTI's efforts should be student centered, and we support the inclusion of dedicated staff members to support cross-campus enrollment in online courses. Such staff are clearly needed for these critical aspects of improving the effectiveness of cross-campus enrollment for UC students.

Expanding the use of the developed Cross-Campus Enrollment System (CCES) to other suitable academic programs seems like a good idea. However, we believe that such programs should be served by CCES only if this helps students participate in these programs. Whether the associated technical staff should be retained at the unit overseeing ILTI or moved to the IT unit at UCOP is beyond our area of expertise.

Sincerely,

Maureen Callanan, Chair
Committee on Teaching

cc: Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
    Minghui Hu, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom
    David Smith, Chair, Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid
    Sylvanna Falcón, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
    Tracy Larrabee, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy
    Yat Li, Chair, Committee on Courses of Instruction
    Brent Haddad, Chair, Committee on Information Technology
    Julie Guthman, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure
    Ken Pedrotti, Chair, Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections
    Nico Orlandi, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare
    Senate Executive Committee
February 9, 2021

David Brundage, Chair
Academic Senate


Dear David,

At its meeting of January 21, 2020, the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) reviewed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) report and recommendations for the future, along with the October 2020 information update.

CPB’s review raised the following points: 1) this program has benefited faculty interested in developing online classes, with many being developed and with a high level of quality; 2) there are also concerns about the characteristics of this program as an initiative centered at the UC Office of the President (OP), and the consequent lack of a clearly defined role of the divisional Senates in ensuring the uniform oversight of course quality. While the online program has the welcome capability to add to the portfolio of large enrollment lower division classes, the upper division and graduate courses are structurally prone to variations in quality lacking regular Senate oversight.

For upper division and graduate level courses, the possibility of intercampus offerings is promising. The planning of such courses, overlapping with campus offerings, is likely to be a non-trivial exercise, requiring considerable cooperation between departments across campuses, balancing workloads of faculty and handling student evaluations. Any attempt to scale the current program without this type of analysis is likely to be unhelpful. It also seems important to obtain and analyze feedback on the courses offered in the recent past. This should include a study of the reports of ground level difficulties expressed by students at UCSC. The present report largely ignores these issues.

CPB feels that the report's proposal to appoint leadership with faculty status is a step in the right direction, and would recommend going a step beyond by considering the appointment of an academic Senate member with distinction in research and teaching from the UC system and with a strong interest in online teaching.

Sincerely,

Dard Neuman, Chair
Committee on Planning and Budget

cc: Minghui Hu, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom
    David Smith, Chair, Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid
    Sylvanna Falcón, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
    Yat Li, Chair, Committee on Courses of Instruction
    Brent Haddad, Chair, Committee on Information Technology
    Maureen Callanan, Chair, Committee on Teaching
    Tracy Larrabee, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy
DAVID BRUNDAGE, Chair
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division


Dear David,

On February 10, 2021, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T) discussed the report, Innovative Learning Technology Initiatives: Recommendations for Future State. With an eye toward P&T purview, the committee identified the following areas of concern:

At the level of institutional faculty rights, P&T members were concerned about the potential abrogation of faculty rights over courses and curricula as enshrined in Standing Orders of the Regents 105.2.b. and APM 015.Part I – Professional Rights of Faculty. One member provided a telling example wherein a faculty member developed an online course through the ILTI initiative that did not fit in the department’s curriculum. Course development through this initiative cannot make an end-run around normal processes of curriculum development established on and for the campuses.

At the level of individual faculty rights and privileges, P&T members were concerned about the potential of faculty members being assigned to develop and teach online courses against their will, especially when course pedagogy is a matter core to our academic freedom rights. In the absence of policies and procedures outlining how courses are assigned and whether developing and teaching online courses will become an expectation (we hope not), members were concerned about the potential for grievances and disciplinary actions related to online teaching.

A subset of this second point concerns the possibility of faculty members being forced to teach an online course developed for ILTI by another faculty member. In another example from our committee, a member was happy to teach an existing ILTI course developed by a campus colleague, only to find that they were unable to adjust aspects of the materials and even communication aspects of the course. This was a non-negotiable aspect of the ILTI-online course they were not aware of before-hand, and which made them swear off teaching such courses developed by others in the future. The committee noted that this is not only an academic freedom concern, but also could affect the merit review process since a professor of record might be evaluated for course content they did not develop.
Thank you for the opportunity to opine on this matter.

Sincerely,

/s/
Julie Guthman, Chair
Committee on Privilege and Tenure

cc:  Sylvanna Falcon, Chair, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
     Minghui Hu, Chair, Committee on Academic Freedom
     Tracy Larrabee, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy
     Brent Haddad, Chair, Committee on Information Technology
     Dard Neuman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
     Maureen Callanan, Chair, Committee on Teaching
     David Smith, Chair, Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid
     Yat Li, Chair, Committee on Courses of Instruction
     Ken Pedrotti, Chair, Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections
     Nico Orlandi, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare
     Senate Executive Committee
February 8, 2021

Professor Mary Gauvain
Chair, Academic Senate
University of California
VIA EMAIL

Re: Innovative Learning Technology Initiative Report

Dear Professor Gauvain,

The Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Report was distributed to San Diego Divisional Senate standing committees and discussed at the February 1, 2021 Divisional Senate Council meeting.

Senate Council members commented that the Report was out of date, given when the review was completed (in 2018) and given the experience acquired in remote learning since then due to COVID. In general, members preferred that ILTI restrict itself to multi-campus projects. There was a strong sentiment that we are still in the midst of a crisis and the focus now should continue to be on how best to navigate our way through the end of the crisis. The timing is not right to re-examine UC remote learning in the long-term.

The responses from the Divisional Committee on Academic Information Technology, the Educational Policy Committee, Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council are attached.

Sincerely,

Steven Constable
Chair
San Diego Divisional Academic Senate

Attachments
cc: Tara Javidi, Vice Chair, San Diego Divisional Academic Senate
Ray Rodriguez, Director, San Diego Divisional Academic Senate
Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, UC Systemwide Academic Senate
January 22, 2021

PROFESSOR STEVEN CONSTABLE, Chair
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

SUBJECT: ILTI Report Review

Dear Chair Constable,

At its January 14, 2021 meeting, the Committee on Academic Information Technology (CAIT) reviewed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiatives: Recommendations for Future State report. The discussion and findings were led by a CAIT sub-committee (Barry Grant, Celeste Pilegard, and Beth Simon), and includes input and approval from all of CAIT. CAIT is in accordance with some parts of all three recommendations, we also raise some significant concerns. We explicitly note very divided opinions on the value of continuing to develop new cross-campus courses at all, given the poor student completion rate and the cost of maintaining the Cross-Campus Enrollment System (CCES). Below, find results of our discussion of the 3 core recommendations, followed by specific responses requested by Senate Leadership.

Recommendation 1: Eliminate Non-Matriculated Student Enrollment
Agreed. Little impact seen, leave this market to UC Extension.

Recommendation 2: Create a New UC Online Program
Agreed on renaming plans.

A. Fund and Develop New Online Courses
CAIT strongly supported moving funding to campuses as block-grants, to be best targeted to supporting campus needs and hopefully requiring less paperwork and procedure to process and on which to report.

The committee was divided in terms of continuing to fund a systemwide competition, given the entire group's recommendation for the "systemwide competition" as next discussed.

Regarding the systemwide competition, the committee felt strongly that the focus of this funding should be exclusively on cross-campus proposed courses, proposed from more than one campus, for high-demand courses (on all contributing campuses) and agreed, in advance, to be approved as meeting major or GE requirements for that course on that campus.

From our own experiences, and as best we can ascertain from the report, ILTI has not done well at meeting major/minor requirements for students on "other" campuses (although this information is not presented explicitly in the report). As we know, approval for an "off-campus" course to substitute for a core major class can be difficult to attain as it is directly controlled by individual departments (often through an undergraduate curriculum committee). However, we consider the following to be critical:
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• Introductory major requirement courses are often barriers to students continuing in their major (especially in STEM majors). These need any and all support they can get from UC to support both students completing their major and reducing time to degree.

• Many departments have faculty particularly interested in and/or responsible for introductory courses. We hope those faculty have a specific interest in quality educational experiences.

• All UC departments do support community college equivalencies, which would seem to be a starting point for arguing for development of an online course that could be accepted for credit at more than one UC campus.

To summarize, if a systemwide competition is to be supported, it should focus exclusively on the kinds of courses that are designed-in-advance to yield a high return on investment. To this end they should be high-enrollment, pre-approved, and possibly gateway courses jointly proposed from more than one campus (3 was a suggested minimum).

It should be expected that these courses be designed using evidence-based teaching practices that leverage the unique benefits of online affordances for learning and leverage the best teaching resources and experiences regarding that course on each campus, regardless of the title of the individual (e.g. Unit-18 lecturers may bring critical experience with such classes).

There was little support for pure "innovative" courses as it was thought these were fundable at the campus level and would not likely be high return on investment for cross-campus enrollments without the kind of "pre-approved" status outlined in the previous paragraph.

B. Manage Cross-Campus Enrollments and Operations

The committee was in agreement that integrating IT support into ITS is likely more efficient and provides more stability of support in possible face of open positions.

While there was some support for CCES (possibly expanding use of to leverage one of the biggest achievements of ILTI), this support was greatly tempered by the following:

• At UC San Diego, it was felt that few undergraduate student affairs/advisors even knew of the existence of the cross-campus enrollment system, let alone whether any of the courses offered their would meet the requirements/needs of their students

• CCES will not be a "no-cost" system to maintain. What are the understandings of how much this will cost to be updated to meet changing enrollment systems on the various campuses? What is the estimated cost for maintenance? What is the relative cost to expend use to new programs compared to current procedures and who would bear these costs? CAIT felt that these questions are important to examine as part of a CCES plan.
As difficult as it is to stomach the current losses in the development of the CCES system, this must be measured with much more specificity against the costs of maintaining or expanding the system.

C. Coordinate Systemwide Instructional Technology Efforts

There was agreement (from those who experienced it) that support from ILTI instructional designers (IDs) was appreciated, but also belief that on-campus IDs would be preferable because of their knowledge of local systems and issues. With the expanded understanding (at the campus level) of the value of IDs, it isn't clear that there is superior knowledge that can only be held at the systemwide level that campuses shouldn't be expecting to hire themselves.

The idea of a system-level support of "software review" and/or negotiations seemed unlikely to have much benefit. Primarily, we continue to doubt the likelihood of getting 10 campuses to agree in a timely manner on educational software investment. At the moment of this writing, we have multiple departments on campus negotiating their own deals with Piazza because professors can't afford to wait for campus to manage the process. Additionally, modulo extant LMS decisions, much of educational technology adoption we have seen lately falls more in the "startup" realm -- smaller companies and/or those producing more discipline specific products. Use of new educational software from the "giants" like Microsoft or Cengage does not seem popular at UC San Diego. Educational software identification and adoption is coming more from "grassroots" faculty identification and it was unclear how a grassroots approach would make use of systemwide support before local support.

Recommendation 3: Restructure Administration and Governance

The committee did not have strong views on the proposed administration and governance recommendations except to note that it aligns with that of other cross-campus programs. It was noted that the size and make-up of the council could make the definition of council responsibilities and the development of consensus-building techniques important to avoid management difficulties.

Supplemental Questions for UC Senate Leadership

- Given that ILTI courses often have been developed in coordination with individual faculty rather than with campus departments, how can ILTI develop a more appropriate and effective partnership with campuses such that it positively impacts the core teaching mission of the University?
  - At the system level focus on cross-campus proposed courses, proposed from more than one campus, for high-demand courses (on all contributing campuses) and agreed, in advance, to be approved as meeting major or GE requirements for that course on that campus.
  - Otherwise, use the block grant model to allow individual campuses to focus on the instructional needs most impacting our core teaching mission.
• What is the potential role and impact of ILTI on the core teaching mission of the University?
  o Reduce time to degree, increase success of students in high-enrollment barrier introductory courses, support students with diverse backgrounds and needs (not having to commute to campus as much, support for flexible schedules to support those with jobs).
• What can the systemwide ILTI program best provide for the campuses: instructional design guidance, best online teaching practices, multicampus instructional innovations, cross-campus enrollment through the CCES platform? Other?
  o Cross campus enrollment.
• What kinds of systemwide courses should be created and how should their utility in achieving the UC teaching mission be assessed?
  o Cross-campus proposed courses, proposed from more than one campus, for high-demand courses (on all contributing campuses) and agreed, in advance, to be approved as meeting major or GE requirements for that course on that campus.
  o High failure rate introductory/gateway STEM courses which would benefit from bringing together best practices educators across campuses and supporting them in adopting best-practices online and/or adaptive educational approaches
• What should the ILTI governing structure be?
  o The committee did not feel we could critique or comment on this.

Important Caveats and Messaging

It is hard to identify the best path forward for ILTI given the following issues:
• the delayed release of the report
• the impact of Covid-related online teaching experiences both for faculty and students

CAIT believes that whatever recommendations are adopted regarding ILTI that it is CRITICAL that we revisit online learning needs and opportunities sometime after the return to on-campus teaching. We have seen examples of faculty in specific departments and classes succeeding in ways that dramatically differ from the norm, and we believe those faculty should be at the heart of supporting development of future online learning experiences. Literature on faculty change regarding teaching reveals that faculty don't "make changes" because of research reports. Faculty make changes due to recommendations from others in their department and occasionally from outside faculty in their discipline. The committee recommends that both UC San Diego and UC systemwide look for those faculty change agents who are most likely to have an impact. Essentially, let's identify, from our pandemic online teaching experiences, the best courses on each campus and the best courses cross-campus/discipline and leverage those as effectively as possible to influence design and offering of better online courses.

Sincerely,

Ian Galton, Chair
Committee on Academic Information Technology
cc: T. Javidi
    J. Lucius
    R. Rodriguez
    B. Simon
January 22, 2021

PROFESSOR STEVEN CONSTABLE, Chair
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

SUBJECT: ILTI Report Review

The Educational Policy Committee (EPC) reviewed the report entitled, “Innovative Learning Technology Initiative – Recommendations for Future State” at its November 17, 2020 meeting. The Committee endorsed the Report’s recommendations, noting that the changes seem logical.

Sincerely,

Geoffrey Cook, Chair
Educational Policy Committee

cc: T. Javidi
    J. Lucius
    P. Rangamani
    R. Rodriguez
January 19, 2021

PROFESSOR STEVEN CONSTABLE, Chair
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

SUBJECT: ILTI Report Review

At its January 11, 2021 meeting, the Graduate Council reviewed the report entitled, “Innovative Learning Technology Initiative – Recommendations for Future State”. In addition to an unclear subtitle, the report does not consider the implications for graduate education. Data are provided on the number and kind of online courses over time on all UC campuses but no data are provided on the number of graduate students employed or what they do. The Council recommends that data about graduate employment and some assessment of the impact on graduate education be provided in the future.

Sincerely,

Lynn Russell, Chair
Graduate Council

cc: B. Cowan
T. Javidi
J. Lucius
R. Rodriguez
January 14, 2021

PROFESSOR STEVEN CONSTABLE, Chair
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

SUBJECT: Review of the ILTI Report

At its December 11, 2020 meeting, the Undergraduate Council reviewed the report entitled, “Innovative Learning Technology – Recommendations for Future State.” The Council is in general support of the recommendations to restructure the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) as outlined in the report and highlighted in the executive summary. The Council hesitates, at this time, to support any expansion of the program, noting that we are currently in the middle of an unplanned systemwide experiment with remote instruction, and that this current situation begs us to further assess the role and the future demand for online learning in the UC system.

The Council encourages further data collection and analyses of students’ experience with ILTI courses and an in-depth analysis of the learning outcomes and impact on student satisfaction. There also needs to be a clear articulation of how ILTI courses uniquely benefit UC students, particularly in a post-COVID world. Finally, the Council discussed that one possible outcome of our current remote learning “experiment” might be both continued development of excellent online curriculum and faculty and student demand for more in-person experiences. In this case, there may be more of a blurred line between what is an “in person” course and what is an “online” course. Thus, the Council supports the idea of using ILTI resources to develop online content that could be integrated into in-person courses in addition to courses offered in a fully remote modality.

Sincerely,

Jane Teranes, Chair
Undergraduate Council

cc: A. Booker
    T. Javidi
    J. Lucius
    R. Rodriguez
February 16, 2021

MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR,
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: INNOVATIVE LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE (ILTI): RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STATE

Dear Mary,

The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) has reviewed the report “Innovative Learning Technology Initiatives: Recommendations for Future State” dated August 1, 2020, and October updates. The report is the result of a review of ILTI initiated in 2018 and directed by Provost Michael Brown at the request of former UC President Napolitano.

UCEP commends ILTI for the excellent work it has accomplished over the last decade to foster high-quality online education in the UC system and to facilitate cross-campus enrollment in online courses. The committee appreciates the thoughtfulness and thoroughness of the report and agrees with the overarching future goals identified therein, i.e., simplifying the structure and streamlining the organization of the program in order to maximize its effectiveness in providing opportunities for online education across the UC system. UCEP is also generally supportive of the three major recommendations outlined in the report but offers some modifications and additional suggestions, as described below.

The first recommendation, elimination of the program for non-matriculated students currently known as UC Online, is based on the observations that this program enrolls relatively few students, suffers from inconsistent course offerings, and competes for students with UC Extension. UCEP endorses the recommendation to remove service to non-matriculated students from the future ILTI’s mission and to restrict these efforts to the purview of UC Extension.

The second recommendation concerns the name and mission of the program. The suggestion to rename ILTI is intended to provide a more transparent, understandable title for the program. While UCEP supports this general goal, the committee does not agree with the specific suggestion to change the name to UC Online. This proposed name is likely to cause considerable confusion both because another program with the same name has existed for several years and, more importantly, because the name has the same structure as a campus name and could therefore be misinterpreted to suggest that the unit is a peer or rival of the campuses, rather than a service to support them. A name that clearly conveys the latter function, such as UC Systemwide Instructional Design, should be selected instead.

UCEP also supports the suggestions to focus the program’s efforts in three key areas (managing cross-campus enrollments, coordinating systemwide instructional technology support, and a simplified grants program to support online course development) with the following caveats. First, any efforts to prioritize cross-campus
enrollments must be accompanied by the articulation and implementation of a budget model that is acceptable to all of the campuses. Second, as noted by Provost Brown in his cover letter, significant advances in content development and improvement of on-line delivery of courses have occurred in recent years on each campus and there should be an increased focus on campus-based efforts in on-line education going forward. Thus, the future ILTI should prioritize the provision of larger and more frequent block grants to the campuses and should serve primarily as a complementary and additive provider of online content rather than as a locale of course development.

The third recommendation concerns the administrative structure of the program. UCEP supports the proposal to have a single faculty leader with a 5-year term who reports to the Vice President for Graduate and Undergraduate Affairs/Vice Provost for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion and a Governing Council to include representatives of UC senior management and systemwide Academic Senate. UCEP also notes, however, that, in order to provide continuity and ongoing institutional memory, it will be important to maintain strong advisory roles for staff members with long-term experience with and expertise about the program, as exemplified by the current directors of ILTI. UCEP also supports the adoption of the following structural elements described in the report: a formal charter to be updated at least every five years, a five-year strategic plan, an annual operating budget, and an annual report for stakeholders. Here again, UCEP notes the paramount importance of development and communication of a clear and transparent budget model.

UCEP also agrees that transitioning the program currently known as ILTI to one campus is not advisable, as doing so could easily compromise the systemwide status and impact of the program. The current placement (effective July 1, 2020) of the program in the Educational Innovations and Services unit of UCOP’s department of Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs, is logical and appropriate.

Finally, UCEP endorses the Vision Statement and Future Goals provided on pp. 17-18 of the report. These statements provide clear and laudable objectives that should be achievable by following the recommendations discussed above. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter. Please don’t hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Daniel Potter, Chair
UCEP
MARY GAUVAIN  
CHAIR, ACADEMIC COUNCIL  

RE: UCAADE comments on the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI)  

Dear Mary,  

UCAADE supports the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) on the basis of its outreach to a wide population of Californians, many of them possibly from underserved communities; its faculty support for the creation of new courses and of cross campus curriculum, and the use of on-line resources in times when in-person teaching is not possible.  

UCAADE identified the following concerns with the presented document:  

1) Efficacy serving underserved communities: We would like to see ILTI be used to reach out students from underserved communities for whom life in campus may be unaffordable, or simply out of reach due to other life commitments/needs. On-line education should include a plan to ensure that students have good access to on-line materials and that courses are delivered in a computationally efficient manner.  

2) Serving students with special needs: ILTI should not be another source of inequality among students. ILTI will need to carefully draft a plan to ensure that students with special needs have equal access to the programs and that potential learning difficulties are addressed.  

3) Potential decrease of the quality of the UC Education: Multiple factors may contribute to the decrease of the quality due to the on-line format of the proposed courses. These include: (1) decrease role of tenure/tenure track faculty in teaching. We are concerned that faculty efforts may be reduced as part of the program and instead campuses may opt for hiring instructors to lead these efforts. (2) Evaluation of students: as we are seeing with the current pandemic it is difficult to guarantee honesty in on-line tests (3) Learning experience: for many students learning on fully on-line environments, will not be the same as in campus and therefore some benefits will be lost.  

4) Possible competition between campuses: Currently there seems to be no master plan on how these programs will be implemented, UCOP seems to be relying on the strengths of each campus for the development of these programs and student demands therefore there is the concern that campuses may end up fighting for both resources and students to ensure the programs are sustainable.  

5) Organization of the program: While a detailed picture of the administration of the program is presented in the current document, the role of the faculty in this upper-level organization needs to be laid out. We recommend that faculty members are involved in all three branches
of the organizational chart as well as a representation of those overseen diversity, equity and inclusion. Faculty members should be involved in a careful examination of the program for its intellectual contribution, as well as its equitable implementation. Similarly, an increased representation of the faculty in the steering committee may be needed. In particular, the steering committee and council should include DEI faculty advisors. This will help address issues concerning points 1 and 2 of this document.

6) Academic goal: as presented, there is a lack of academic goal or vision for the program. It seems to be suggesting the program will grow according to the competitive RFPs announced by UCOP. This format is problematic and may grow into something academically meaningless.

7) Evaluation of the program: Without clear guidelines on goals, on DEI, or on social and educational impacts, it will be difficult to determine whether the program is successful or not.

Sincerely,

Javier Arsuaga
Chair, UCAADE
MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review with Update

Dear Mary,

The University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) has discussed the review and update of the Innovation Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI), and we have several comments. First, members note a lack of innovation regarding pedagogy and strategy in the online education realm. Moreover, there is little content addressing equity and inclusion metrics or objectives. Insofar as this report was a program review focusing on organizational structure, we have no substantive feedback. However, we wish to emphasize that the Senate is responsible for academic quality, and we find the implications of this report troubling. Unclear plans for cross-campus enrollment, and whether decisions are being motivated by student success concerns, rather than institutional financial metrics, must be addressed. Many have experienced the difficulty of large lecture classes in the online setting. We have seen first-hand the erosion in the intellectual community over the last year of pandemic-driven changes to our delivery of education, including the negative effects of large-scale remote instruction.

UCFW suggests undertaking a comprehensive review of online teaching and learning efforts in a post-COVID environment so that still-emerging lessons can be incorporated and a fulsome online pedagogy can be developed and deployed. Clearly, this will need to be a joint undertaking with the administration.

Sincerely,

Shelley Halpain, UCFW Chair

Copy: UCFW
Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Robert Horwitz, Academic Council Vice Chair
MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: INNOVATIVE LEARNING TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE (ILTI)

Dear Mary,

UCPB appreciates the opportunity to opine on the October 2020 Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) update. We also appreciate that the thinking about this topic at the UC has moved away from simplistic view of online education as a cost saving mechanism associated with the MOOC (Massive Open Online Courses) boom towards a more nuanced and sophisticated understanding of the costs and benefits associated with these courses. We support a number of the recommendations in this report, including the elimination of the non-matriculated student program, increasing the amount and proportion of funds distributed to the campuses, simplifying the different types of funding, and the creation of a small governing council to oversee these efforts.

However, the committee also has a number of potential concerns. First, the report, drafted before the pandemic, fails to provide a rationale for the expansion of cross-campus enrollment system. In fact, cross-campus enrollments made up a diminishing portion of online course enrollments and have been plagued by high drop-out rates so it is unclear that it is ripe for further expansion at this time. It is also unclear what role ILTI can play in an environment that trends towards intra-campus enrollments rather than inter-campus enrollments of online courses. Finally, any consideration of the future role of ILTI should take into account how students and faculty react to online/remote education during COVID-19. Since knowledge of online instruction has grown during the pandemic, perhaps block grants for campuses might be a useful way of building on and institutionalizing some of the lessons learned during this period of ad hoc experimentation. Finally, we must continue to resist the temptation to see online education as a cost-saving measure or a way to increase enrollments “on the cheap.” Any discussion of either on-campus or cross-campus online
courses must be rooted in a realistic assessment of the costs associated with developing UC quality online courses.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Sean Malloy, Chair
UCPB

cc: UCPB
MARY GAUVAIN  
CHAIR, ACADEMIC COUNCIL  

RE: Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review with Update  

Dear Mary,  

UCORP discussed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review with Update at its meeting on February 8th.  

Committee members expressed a number of concerns with the report. While in itself the development of online courses at UC, including a platform to support and coordinate this effort among campuses is welcome, we noted that consideration of programmatic issues related to online learning (for example those considered in the online degree taskforce report) was missing from the report. Specifically, the report does not well address the concern with the development of online degrees at UC.  

In line with our committee’s concern that “Instruction-Only Remote Degree Programs” are not consistent with UC’s role as a premier research university, we recommend that further thought is given to the research dimension of the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative. An important question is whether the role of, and opportunity for, research is considered in the evaluation of online courses that are part of ILTI.  

A separate but related concern that arose is the potential for online courses to ignite competition among campuses for students and thus funding. The committee felt that the latter needs to be considered in a careful and balanced manner in relation to the potential for integration, mobility, and broadened access. Other concerns included the perception that some courses have a high incompletion rate. ILTI seems to operate as a separate entity from UC as well as more generally the potential negatives of the unfettered proliferation of online courses.  

UCORP appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on this report.  

Sincerely,  

Richard Desjardins  
Chair, University Committee on Research Policy
February 9, 2021

Mary Gauvain
Chair, UC Academic Senate

Re: (Systemwide Senate Review) Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review

Dear Chair Gauvain,

The Divisional Executive Board, councils, and committees appreciate the opportunity to review the proposed revision to (Systemwide Senate Review) Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review.

Executive Board members concurred with the comments expressed in the attached committee statements. After discussion, Executive Board members unanimously endorsed a motion not to approve the proposal as written, to endorse the cross-campus enrollment section, but to transfer all other ILTI operations to the campuses.

Sincerely,

Shane White
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Encl.

Cc: Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, UCLA Academic Senate
Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate
January 29, 2021

To: Shane White, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Susan Cochran, Chair
    Committee on Data, Information Technology, and Privacy


At its meeting on January 28, 2021, the Committee on Data, Information Technology, and Privacy (CDITP) reviewed and discussed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review and offered the following for consideration:

Committee members were heartened by the report’s efforts to identify the most appropriate homes for aspects of ILTI’s portfolio. Members were pleased at the plan to move much of the IT management into the ITS group at UCOP where existing expertise is better equipped to meet the IT need of enrollment management. Contract negotiations is likely another task that could be housed in the unit at UCOP that conducts software contractual arrangements for the UC. While ILTI might coordinate the list of desired software, negotiations would likely benefit from leveraging the University’s depth of resources in contract negotiation.

Members also opined that faculty across the UC are now much more familiar and experienced with the intricacies of online education in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. In recognition of this rapid increase in expertise and the emerging expertise on the campuses in constructing online courses, committee members supported the initiative to transfer as much funding and decision-making to the campuses, particularly around course construction, as possible.

Lastly, members noted that it was essential to identify what aspects of ILTI’s role would be coordination versus support for the campuses. Some aspects of UC-wide online presence can benefit from a uniformity of approach. Members noted that key to the success of the program would be the ability of the UC to leverage cutting-edge approaches to online education. Identifying what structure (central, federated, or any other alternative) will achieve that is key.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via the CDITP Analysts, Estrella Arciba/Taylor Lane Daymude, at earciba@senate.ucla.edu/ tlanedaymude@senate.ucla.edu.
January 26, 2021

Shane White, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Systemwide Review: ILTI Review

Dear Chair White,

At its meeting on January 19, 2021, the Faculty Welfare Committee discussed the ILTI Review. Committee members offered the following comments.

Members found this review to offer some recommendations but no concrete proposals. Members pointed out the low completion rates of these online courses, which need to be addressed.

Additionally, members advised against the push for online instruction. In-person classes and online classes differ substantially. The quality of instruction may suffer if fully online, and students suffer as well. Although revenue may increase, quality will inevitably suffer.

If you have any questions, please contact us via the Faculty Welfare Committee’s interim analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at efeller@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Huiying Li, Chair
Faculty Welfare Committee

cc: Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, Academic Senate
    Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Elizabeth Feller, Interim Analyst, Faculty Welfare Committee
    Members of the Faculty Welfare Committee
January 27, 2021

To: Shane White, Chair  
Academic Senate


As requested, the Academic Senate Committee on Teaching discussed the ILTI review during our January 12, 2021, meeting. There was a brief but robust discussion. Here are the main points for consideration and concern that emerged in the committee’s discussion:

1. Understanding the timing of reviews like this, there was notably little mention of the pandemic or things that had emerged during the forced movement into widespread online teaching that might help inform how best to move forward. What role did these courses play in delivery during the pandemic?
2. The committee agreed that earmarked funding for the initiative is important and ensuring that it is the campuses who have the resources to implement and improve online teaching through this initiative. However, campus buy-in is important. How big is the appetite for this project more generally?
3. Faculty expressed concern over the low completion rates. At UCLA the registration process requires a number of steps that delay start dates and can put students behind before they even begin the coursework, perhaps contributing to the completion problem. Streamlining this and making it more accessible across campus would facilitate the program and its utility.
4. Faculty endorsed the name change, but were confused about the specific rebranding of UConline
5. Efforts to implement more of this program (or other online teaching) must be accompanied by universities determining what they will count toward their degree programs. When we move to more hybrid programs post-pandemic, what will it mean for students and for faculty as far as expectations go in teaching in-persona and online.
6. What role do faculty play in this review and in working together to implement changes that come from it?

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this review. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at collett@soc.ucla.edu or the Committee’s analyst Renee Rouzan-Kay at rrouzankay@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Jessica L. Collett, Chair  
Committee on Teaching

cc: Shane White, Academic Senate, Chair
Jody Kreiman, Academic Senate, Vice Chair/ Chair-Elect
Michael Meranze, Academic Senate, Immediate Past Chair
April de Stefano, Academic Senate, Executive Director
To: Shane White, Chair  
Academic Senate  

From: David Gere, Chair  
Committee on Continuing and Community Education  

Date: January 26, 2021  


At its meeting on January 21, 2021, the Committee on Continuing and Community Education reviewed and discussed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review and offered the following for consideration:  

Committee members expressed concerns regarding the administration and funding of UC Online. Rather than a centralized approach, members felt that funding and administration of online courses are best governed at the campus level to maintain quality control on the content. Members recommend that funding be directed to individual campuses for investment in IT support and infrastructure to build out hybrid and online courses and to support faculty with course development.  

Student members, in particular, felt that more students at UCLA would make use of UC Online if the campus developed a mechanism for impacted courses to be offered in an online format.  

Members were surprised by the low completion rate and recommended that UC Online work harder to support student achievement and degree completion.  

Members were generally supportive of Recommendation 1: Eliminate the Non-Matriculated Student enrollment efforts previously branded as UC Online as there does not seem to be demand and because the cost of the program is prohibitive. One member noted, however, that “non-matriculated students” sometimes includes international students who need to complete a course in English at a top university in order to demonstrate that they are capable of attending. How might they accomplish this goal if enrollment for non-matriculated students is eliminated?  

Lastly, members noted that it was unfortunate that UCLA Extension was not asked to opine separately on the issue as they might have offered valuable insights on online programming. Why were they not consulted?  

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via the interim Committee on Continuing and Community Education analyst, Emily Le, at ele@senate.ucla.edu.
January 26, 2021

To: Shane White, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Megan McEvoy, Chair, Undergraduate Council


At its meeting on January 22, 2021, the Undergraduate Council reviewed the Systemwide Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review. The Council consulted with its Curriculum Committee, which discussed the Review at their meeting on January 20, 2021.

Members were generally in favor of decentralizing the activities of a centralized administrative entity like ILTI as much as possible, and distributing more funds to campuses. The October 2020 Update notes, “From 2013-2016, ILTI received $10M in annual funding. In 2017, the funding was reduced to $9M. ... ILTI has distributed over 60% of its funding to campuses since inception.” Members recommend that the percentage of funding going to campuses be substantially increased, particularly in light of the Review’s recommendation that centralized administration and governance be restructured to streamline and reduce administrative burden. Some Council members attested to the quality of local support at UCLA for faculty developing online and hybrid courses from offices such as the Center for the Advancement of Teaching (CAT) and Social Sciences Computing (SSC).

Members expressed concern about the low enrollment rates and the extraordinarily high attrition rates of ILTI cross-campus enrollment courses. As the October 2020 Update notes, “For cross-campus courses, approximately 65% of all initial enrollments are dropped before the end of the add/drop period.” A few members expressed skepticism about the UC undergraduate online enrollment numbers provided in the report, noting that our Registrar’s Office data indicate that fewer than 70 UCLA undergraduates complete cross-campus courses offered by another campus per quarter (Table 1); and fewer than 120 UC (non-UCLA) undergraduates complete cross-campus courses offered by UCLA per quarter (Table 2).

Table 1: UCLA Undergraduate Completion of Cross-Campus Courses by Quarter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>19F</th>
<th>20W</th>
<th>20S</th>
<th>20F</th>
<th>21W*</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCI</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>244</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Because this report was generated during Winter 2021, these numbers represent student enrollment to date, not completed courses.

Prepared by Claire McCluskey, Associate Registrar, UCLA Registrar’s Office (January 26, 2021)
Table 2: UC (Non-UCLA) Undergraduate Completion of Cross-Campus Courses at UCLA by Quarter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj Area</th>
<th>19F</th>
<th>20W</th>
<th>20S</th>
<th>20F</th>
<th>21W*</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;O SCI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF AMER</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN N EA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMENIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM HLT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPS SCI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM TV</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLB HLT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA STD</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLM ST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS SCI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL SCI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAND</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAHILI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEATER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURKIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIDDISH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>366</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Because this report was generated during Winter 2021, these numbers represent student enrollment to date, not completed courses.

Prepared by Claire McCluskey, Associate Registrar, UCLA Registrar’s Office (January 26, 2021)

Registrar’s Office staff described ILTI as “high effort, low yield”; despite the substantial amount of money that has gone into the Cross-Campus Enrollment System (CCES), enrolling and dropping students and creating visitor records remains a highly manual and time-intensive process for staff. At UCLA, students are required to enroll in 12 units before adding cross-campus enrollment courses, which may be one factor driving the low enrollment rates.

Members felt that UCLA students could potentially benefit from the kind of cross-campus enrollment supported by ILTI. Specifically, cross-campus enrollment could help students enroll in high-demand courses (e.g. foreign language courses, calculus, and writing), which could support students’ timely degree completion. However, as the Review notes, the majority of courses in ILTI’s catalog have been specialty courses that are boutique in nature, rather than high-demand courses (p. 9).
If you have any questions, please contact us via the Undergraduate Council’s analyst, Aileen Liu, at aliu@senate.ucla.edu.

cc: April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
    Aileen Liu, Committee Analyst, Undergraduate Council
    Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    Olga Yokoyama, Vice Chair, Undergraduate Council
December 15, 2020

Shane White, Chair
Academic Senate


Dear Chair White,

At its meeting on December 7, 2020, the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) had an opportunity to review and discuss the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review. Members offered the following comments.

Members raised the issue of governance of online efforts. It appears that the governing committee will be composed mostly of administrators. How will shared governance be implemented? It would be faculty’s purview to initiate and oversee academic programs. Similarly, shared governance in multi-campus academic programs has proven to be a challenge—as demonstrated in the Sacramento Center and UCDC, where members expressed concerns for the longer-term administration of these structures.

Other members suggested that it would be important to look at various models of entities that serve multiple campuses and are administered from a single location. Over time, their activity may evolve and more closely reflect the campus where they are located, instead of the broader system.

Finally, a member suggested reviewing data to establish whether there is continuing student interest in the program. The data included in the document suggest a strikingly low completion rate (see page 12 of the August 2020 ILTI Recommendations document), showing substantial majorities of cross-campus enrolled students failing to complete the course in which they were enrolled.

If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me at groeling@comm.ucla.edu or via the Council’s analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at efeller@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,
Tim Groeling, Chair
Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Jody Kreiman, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
    Michael Meranze, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Elizabeth Feller, Principal Policy Analyst, Council on Planning and Budget
    Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
December 15, 2020

To: Shane White, Chair  
Academic Senate

From: Andrea Kasko, Chair  
Graduate Council


At its meeting on December 11, 2020, the Graduate Council reviewed and discussed the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Review and offered the following for consideration:

Members agreed that there must be direct Senate oversight over the courses offered and a parallel Senate-based governance structure. Senate governance and input are necessary to maintain academic quality and rigor. Separate but related, members also thought it would be important to clarify ownership and copyright of course content.

Members stated that it is important to clarify the role of UCOP versus individual campuses. Given the new budget model, members also expressed that the impact on departmental funding and revenue streams should be further clarified. Members wondered how campus departments would benefit from the initiative.

Members seek clarification on whether union rules for academic student employees will apply.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via the Graduate Council analyst, Estrella Arciba, at earciba@senate.ucla.edu.
Innovative Learning Technology Initiative

Recommendations for Future State

August 1, 2020
Version 5.0
Dear Colleagues,

At President Napolitano’s direction, I initiated an extensive assessment of the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) in the summer of 2018. Many members of our community, including the staff at the UC Office of the President and stakeholders from the campuses, provided feedback. I sought to understand the current state of ILTI and to understand what our community members felt should be maintained, improved, and changed in the future.

This document contains recommendations for repositioning what is now ILTI, and for the use of state funds that are allocated to the UC system to support online education. These recommendations are based on nearly 40 interviews and a review of background materials, including data sets and other documents provided by program stakeholders.

My own review made several things clear to me. For one, we have an incredibly strong team across the UC dedicated to online education, one that includes and goes beyond the staff within ILTI: registrars, deans, faculty, and administrators who support online courses at our campuses. We have also collectively achieved several significant accomplishments, including:

- A technical system that facilitates enrollment between campuses, an almost unheard-of feat in American higher education;
- Hundreds of innovative online courses that have served thousands of students across the campuses; and
- Increased interest in and adoption of online instructional modalities amongst our faculty.

I can reasonably say that we have done justice to the goals that Governor Brown established when he first offered funding to UC in 2012-2013 to invest in online education. I have also concluded, after speaking with colleagues and reviewing the recommendations, that it would not be wise to transition ILTI or its funding wholesale to a campus in the future. Such a move would not allow us to consistently and equitably achieve the goals that we and the Governor set out for this funding.

Now is the time to chart a new course and continue furthering our mission through online education, and that includes a fundamental “rethinking” about how to best to advance instructional innovation in the online space – and to do this in a collaborative way that best supports the activities underway on the campuses. Our future approach must recognize that over the past few years, each campus has developed its own infrastructures to support online education and, generally, does not require as much central service support from the Office of the President. This evolution necessarily requires that we identify the aspects of current work that are best managed centrally at OP, and which are best left to the campuses for management.

I also believe it is important to critically assess what value the University can achieve by each and every function we pursue. The nature of this work is to be innovative and keep the University of California on the cutting edge, so some endeavors may not pay off in the long-term. We must learn from the past few years and make changes accordingly.
Three principles are central to these recommendations and my vision for the future and will guide our future endeavors in this area:

- Simplifying our organizational structure, funding model, and requirements to reduce the amount of administrative work required both centrally and on the campuses;
- Recognizing the strengths of the campuses and the UC Office of the President to determine which organizations are best positioned to complete certain activities; and
- Directing as much funding as possible to the development of online courses to optimize our impact on the campuses, our faculty, and our students.

Ultimately, it is important for us to retain the strong assets that we have developed over the past five years—most especially the cross-campus enrollment system – but invest our funds to reflect the current situation for the UC system. The future of ILTI and how we allocate funding will look different than its current trajectory: the administrative role of the Office of the President can shrink, and that of the campuses should expand.

I want to thank all the individuals who participated in this assessment through thoughtful conversations with me and my team. I also want to thank the ILTI co-managers – Ellen Osmundson, Mary-Ellen Kreher, and Paul Montoya – for leading this group so successfully over the past few years. On behalf of the University of California, thank you.

The recommendations in this report provide a blueprint for organizing the next phase of UC’s systemwide efforts in support of online education. I look forward to your comments and suggestions as we undertake the next steps.

Appreciatively,

Michael T. Brown, Ph.D.
Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The recommendations that follow are based on an assessment of the current status of the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) conducted by UC Provost Michael T. Brown and a team from Academic Affairs in consultation with Huron. These recommendations provide a framework for repositioning ILTI so that it most effectively supports the campuses in their online course development, and UC generally for online education. There are undoubtedly many more details that need to be determined; these recommendations are intended to facilitate conversations with members of the community and help determine any additional considerations that can inform next steps.

ILTI’s current activities and services can be summarized in the following four general categories:

- **Online Course Development**: ILTI funds faculty and campus administrations to support the development of online and hybrid courses and provides support to more than 50 campus faculty to design, develop, and host online courses available for enrollment to UC students.
- **Undergraduate Student Enrollment**: ILTI facilitates the opportunity for UC undergraduates to enroll in online courses offered by a different campus than their home campus.
- **Non-Matriculated Student Enrollment**: ILTI facilitates the opportunity for non-matriculated students from outside the UC system to enroll in online courses offered by any UC campus.
- **Cross-Campus Enrollment System**: ILTI offers a technology system that facilitates the enrollment of UC students in courses at campuses other than their home campuses.

The recommendations for a future state are centered around opportunities which were suggested and identified during the assessment. These opportunities include:

- **Eliminating** the non-matriculated student program known as UC Online;
- **Increasing** the amount and proportion of funds distributed to the campuses by minimizing internal costs within the UC Office of the President;
- **Rebranding** ILTI to a name that is more permanent and recognizable to stakeholders;
- **Addressing** ILTI’s leadership and organizational structure;
- **Expanding** the use of the cross-campus enrollment system;
- **Simplifying both the different** types of funding offered to the campuses and the reporting requirements for the use of those funds;
- **Refocusing** the staff on efforts for the future.

After consultation with stakeholders on these recommendations, Provost Brown will determine how best and in which priority order to implement them, and to consider others that may arise during the consultation phase.
BACKGROUND

The Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) is a UCOP systemwide initiative housed in the Division of Academic Affairs that advances online education and innovation in the UC system. This section will provide a brief introduction to ILTI, covering the following high-level information:

- An overview and history of the creation of ILTI;
- An overview of its four primary functions, including online course development, undergraduate student enrollment, non-matriculated student enrollment, and the cross-campus enrollment system; and
- An overview of ILTI’s organizational structure and governance.

Overview

Since FY13, the State of California has provided annual funding to support online education at each of the three segments – the University of California, the California State University system, and the California Community Colleges – as a means of increasing access and decreasing the time-to-graduate. These funds were provided to UC as an annual increase to the state general appropriations. Technically, there are no specific restrictions from the State on the use of these funds, though the University verbally agreed to use the funds to support online education. These funds are currently understood as ongoing state support to fund online instructional innovations across the system.

Though each segment decided to spend the annual funds differently, former UC Provost Aimée Dorr’s recommendation to the President, which was accepted, was to direct the funds to create ILTI, which spends the funds directly and through campus transfers. ILTI’s direct expenses are typically related to personnel, technology, marketing, and special projects within the UC Office of the President. Campus transfers are allocated for a variety of purposes, and typically represent a majority of ILTI’s expenses.

There have been several systemwide online education efforts coordinated through the UC Office of the President over the past decade. The most significant effort that preceded the creation of ILTI was UC Online Education (related to the Online Instruction Pilot Program), which eventually evolved into ILTI when Governor Brown offered the $10 million in funding for online education in 2012.

UC Online Education

In 2010, UC President Mark Yudof directed the creation of UC Online Education (UCOE) to accomplish the goal of creating “a systemwide set of campus-based, faculty-developed, high-need undergraduate courses” (2013 ILTI Project Statement). While many UC campuses were already investing in online education, UCOE and its leaders aimed to provide executive-level guidance for online education across the UC system. The program’s leadership oversaw the construction of the UC Online enrollment system to support the creation and offering of fully online courses to UC students. In the fall semester of 2012, UCOE course offerings were opened for the first time to non-UC students (non-matriculated) in addition to currently enrolled UC students. The expansion of UCOE to non-matriculated students allowed the program to enter into a new student market and provided an additional source of revenue.

\[^1\] In 2020 ILTI was moved from the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President to the department of Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs as part of a larger restructuring of the Division of Academic Affairs.
In 2012, California Governor Jerry Brown approached UC requesting that the university further invest in providing online courses for UC students. As student enrollment was increasing across the state of California, campuses faced challenges with course availability.

Using these funds, the UC Provost established ILTI in January 2013. ILTI was housed under the Office of the Provost with the goal of developing additional high-demand online courses that were available to UC undergraduate students across all campuses. The existing UCOE program and the UC Online enrollment system for non-matriculated students were shifted under the umbrella of the newly created ILTI. A series of meetings and workshops were held with stakeholders from across the UC system – including faculty, students, staff, and administrators – to develop a vision, goals, and priorities for ILTI and its use of the state funding. ILTI convened campus registrars, for example, to discuss the potential for cross-campus online learning through the new initiative.

As a result of this planning, during Spring 2013 the program’s leadership announced its intention to build a system that would integrate with campus systems to facilitate undergraduate enrollment across the campuses. To support this system and its functionality, ILTI leveraged an existing agreement with UC Merced’s Students First Center to provide front-end customer support for UC students in cross-campus courses. Building and funding these courses was a key goal of the program, so ILTI launched a competitive RFP process for the first time in Summer 2013 in which campus faculty applied for funding to create and host courses through the cross-campus system. In Fall 2013, ILTI administered its first round of campus grants, which were given directly to each of the ten UC campuses to support the development of online courses and infrastructure for the cross-campus system.

Online Course Development

While each of the UC campuses supports the online course development process to some degree, ILTI also supports the various stages in five key ways:

- **Campus funding**: Providing funds directly to campuses to support various stages of the online course lifecycle that they may pursue on their own;
- **Competitive RFP process**: Administering a robust RFP process through which campus faculty submit online course development proposals and receive financial awards to develop courses;
- **Course catalog**: Maintaining a full catalog of all ILTI-supported courses (any course offered cross-campus or developed using ILTI funding);
- **Instructional design**: Working directly with faculty to design and develop courses; and
- **Learning management system**: Hosting online courses that are developed on an ILTI-specific learning management system.

The RFP process was first conducted in June 2013 and has typically been conducted four times each academic year; it was only conducted three times during 2018. **Over the course of these five years, ILTI received a total of 230 RFP applications.**

ILTI’s course catalog has grown significantly over time due to course development awards offered through the RFP process. The following figure shows the growth of the available course catalog over the last six years, as of July 2018. Note that a much smaller number of courses are typically offered each term.
In its first year of operation, the ILTI catalog consisted of just 11 courses offered by six campuses. **As of July 2018, all ten UC campuses have courses in the ILTI catalog, with a total of 277.** The total number of courses in the catalog has grown each year since AY12. Seven of the ten campuses have increased their number of courses in the catalog every year since AY12. UC Irvine, while not yet live on ILTI’s cross-campus enrollment system, has had the largest number of courses in the catalog each year since AY13.

The majority of courses developed through the RFP process can be grouped into three categories, detailed below.
FIGURE 2: ILTI COURSE CATEGORIES

1. **Innovative Courses**
   - Innovative hybrid or online courses developed and offered through multi-campus partnerships
   - **Bending the Curve: Climate Solutions**
     - *Educating the next generation of change agents in the fight against climate change and global warming.*
     - Launched: 2018
     - Faculty Contributors: 23
     - Campus Hosts: 5

2. **High-Demand Courses**
   - Common courses with high enrollments across the UC system; typically introductory or pre-requisite courses
   - **General Chemistry**
     - Host Campus: Irvine
     - Discipline: STEM
   - **Intro to Psychology**
     - Host Campus: Riverside
     - Discipline: Social Sciences

3. **Specialty Courses**
   - Niche courses that fulfill specific credit requirements in particular fields of study
   - **Digital Tools for Contemporary Art Practices**
     - Host Campus: Santa Cruz
     - Discipline: Arts & Humanities
   - **Intermediate Norwegian**
     - Host Campus: UCLA
     - Discipline: Arts & Humanities

---

**Category 1 – Innovative Courses** represent the smallest number of courses in the catalog. These courses are typically developed collaboratively with faculty from multiple campuses, and truly push the needle in terms of innovative instructional delivery. During stakeholder interviews, the “Bending the Curve: Climate Solutions” course was frequently cited as the most successful and exemplary Category 1 course. “Bending the Curve,” which was first offered in 2018, is a hybrid course that was funded by ILTI and developed by 23 faculty and nine campuses and labs. It has been offered by five campuses, and as several stakeholders noted, accomplishes ILTI’s goal of innovation in education delivery.

**Category 2 – High-Demand Courses** are the second largest group of courses in ILTI’s catalog. These are typically common introductory or pre-requisite courses that have applicability across different UC campuses. When ILTI was founded, one of the specific requests from Governor Brown was that the program use online cross-campus courses as a means of alleviating enrollment challenges and bottlenecks in Category 2 courses.

**Category 3 – Specialty Courses** represent the largest portion of courses in the catalog. Because the open RFP process is the primary means through which courses are added to the catalog, individual faculty interested in online education apply to offer their isolated, specialty courses that are often more niche and less universal. While these courses have significantly contributed to the growth of ILTI’s course catalog, they do not necessarily fit into a deliberate course sequence or count for strategic credit.

**Undergraduate Student Enrollment**

Much like developing online courses, enrolling UC undergraduate students in online courses has remained a goal of the program in some shape or form since its founding. UCOE’s initial focus was enrolling students...
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in online courses generally. When these courses were first offered to non-matriculated students in Fall 2012, ILTI’s mission expanded, but UC undergraduate enrollment remained a focus. With the state funding in FY12 came a renewed challenge to increase opportunities for UC students to enroll in online courses. This sparked the creation of ILTI with the unique mission of enrolling UC undergraduate students in online – and ideally, cross-campus – courses.

Each academic term, ILTI confirms which courses will be offered by communicating with campus faculty and registrars, opens the courses for enrollment, transfers course registrations and grades, and resolves any enrollment issues. At the end of each spring semester, ILTI staff contact faculty who have offered courses in the past or who have received ILTI Competitive Course Awards for the coming year to determine which courses they intend to offer. From there the staff creates a preliminary list of courses and faculty. Roughly 60 days before each term, ILTI staff contact all faculty who responded to confirm these offerings. ILTI staff manually set up the courses being offered for enrollment in the CCES and open them at the beginning of the term. These staff work with the UC Merced Student Support staff to resolve any complications that arise during open enrollment and manage individual student issues.

ILTI focuses a significant amount of effort identifying which courses will be offered in a given term. For example, in AY14, ILTI had 107 total courses in its course catalog, and offered 70 sections of courses from this course catalog to students that year. The following figure highlights ILTI’s undergraduate course offerings over time.

![FIGURE 3: COURSE OFFERINGS BY YEAR AND CAMPUS (AY14-AY16)](image)

The three years shown in the figure above are those for which ILTI has a full academic year of data. Within those three years, ILTI increased its total course offerings by 130% (from 70 to 161 offerings). UC Irvine has consistently offered the most courses, and UC Irvine, UCLA, and UC Berkeley have increased their respective number of course offerings each year for the last three years.

Once an ILTI-supported course has been developed, the course must be articulated across the campuses in order to enroll UC undergraduates in it. Course articulation is the process through which UC faculty review the content of an ILTI cross-campus course and determine whether the course will meet certain
course requirements for the students’ home campus (e.g., general education requirement, major requirement).

Generally, as courses are added to the ILTI course catalog, ILTI staff contact departments on the campuses to discuss the possibility of offering credit for the courses. Faculty at the other campuses review the ILTI course, its content, and its learning objectives to decide what credit (if any) to offer. The level of equivalency given to a specific course at one campus is not necessarily given at every other campus. ILTI’s course articulation efforts typically require individual conversations and agreements across the campuses for a single course.

The figure below summarizes self-reported data from cross-campus and home-campus students identifying the type of credit they received for an ILTI course. This data was collected through course evaluation surveys for 74 course offerings between January 2014 and June 2015.

**FIGURE 4: TYPE OF CREDIT RECEIVED FOR ILTI-SUPPORTED COURSES**

Of the 952 students who responded, one-third were receiving only general education (GE) credit, while 21% were receiving credit toward their major or minor and 17% were receiving unit credit toward graduation.

While ILTI’s courses serve students from one campus who enroll in courses at another, students may also enroll in ILTI courses hosted by their own campus. As such, the reach of ILTI’s courses goes beyond just the students who enroll cross-campus. ILTI reports that between Spring 2013 and 2018, **108,297 student enrollments across the UC system have enrolled in ILTI-supported courses**. This includes students enrolling in cross-campus courses hosted by their own campus or another campus, and students enrolled in online courses that received ILTI funding, even if the courses were not offered cross-campus.

One of primary goals for ILTI was to provide opportunities for UC students to enroll in courses offered by a campus other than their own. The data in the figures below illustrates the cross-campus students who enrolled in ILTI courses between AY14 and AY17 but excludes students who enrolled in ILTI courses hosted by their own campus. For example, UC Davis students enrolling in cross-campus courses hosted by
UC Davis are not included. This figure also highlights the number of students each year who completed a course and those who were dropped from a course.

**FIGURE 5: COURSE COMPLETION BY YEAR (CROSS-CAMPUS ENROLLMENT ONLY, AY14-AY17)**

Across all campuses, the total number of students who enroll in ILTI courses hosted by other campuses has increased each year since AY14. This suggests growing interest in ILTI’s cross-campus course offerings. However, each year the proportion of these students who do not complete the course is larger than the proportion who do complete. For example, AY17 saw ILTI’s highest number of students enrolling cross-campus in ILTI courses to-date – 1,364 students – but 834 of these students did not complete their course. A student may fail to complete for a number of reasons (e.g., home-campus Registrar denies the enrollment for various reasons, student withdraws). This suggests that although cross-campus enrollments in cross-campus courses have increased, the majority of students do not complete them each year.

**Non-Matriculated Student Enrollment**

Since 2012, ILTI has enrolled non-matriculated students in online courses through a program called UC Online. All of the courses were developed through ILTI’s online course development process, and are open to undergraduates as well as non-matriculated students. However, not all courses that are open to UC undergraduates are open to non-matriculated students; the faculty offering the courses must opt into non-matriculated enrollment. Non-matriculated students can gain general education credit that could transfer to UC or another institution and pay roughly $1,400 to $2,100 per course. For comparison, most of the UC extension schools offer online courses in the range of $650 to $750. ILTI splits the revenue for the non-matriculated student enrollments with the campuses.

UC Online serves a distinctly different market than ILTI’s other enrollment offerings. While ILTI’s UC undergraduate enrollment efforts serve a “captive market” (i.e., students who are already matriculated in the

---

2 Data from Fall Quarter/Semester 2014 through Spring Quarter/Semester 2018
UC system), UC Online serves a more general population of learners who are not enrolled at the UC and who purchase UC Online courses as consumers (i.e., the “consumer market”). These may be international students, high school students, adult learners, or undergraduates from non-UC institutions seeking distance education for a variety of reasons.

Since AY12, ILTI has enrolled slightly more than 600 non-matriculated students in over 220 courses hosted by eight of the UC campuses. Over the last six academic years, ILTI has enrolled an average 101 non-matriculated students each year, resulting in an average of $144,000 in revenue each year and a total of $860,000 in tuition revenue since AY12. ILTI has only started generating surpluses from the non-matriculated student enrollments in the past year or two, though it is very difficult to determine how much money has been lost or gained in a given year because the finances for the non-matriculated student enrollments are closely intertwined with the undergraduate student enrollments.

Cross-Campus Enrollment System

To operationalize ILTI’s goal of increasing access to educational opportunities for UC students, development of the cross-campus enrollment system (CCES) began in FY13. ILTI’s leadership decided to invest in this system, which would facilitate systemwide cross-enrollment as a means of providing greater access to courses for UC students. Operationally, the CCES is the platform through which matriculated UC students enroll in online courses offered by faculty on other UC campuses. In the five years since the CCES was launched, ILTI has worked to bring UC campuses onto the system and increase the number of enrollments facilitated through the system each term. Additional CCES detail is provided in the following sub-sections.

The CCES, also referred to as “the Hub,” is comprised of a series of integrated, cloud-based applications that facilitate the student’s cross-campus enrollment experience, from browsing the course catalog to enrolling in a course, completing the course, and receiving a grade on their home campus transcript. The distinctive feature of the CCES is its linkage to the individual campus student information systems (SISs). Designed in a hub-and-spoke model, the CCES serves as the hub or focal point, transferring student enrollment information to and from the individual campus SISs. The figure below depicts the integration between these applications at a high level.
Since FY13, ILTI has invested roughly $13 million in the CCES between ILTI central funding and campus funding. Approximately $8.6 million was spent centrally, while the remaining $4.4 million was given to the campuses to support campuses in making necessary SIS modifications, accommodating specific technical requirements, and facilitating successful integration with the central CCES.

Organization

Until 2020, the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) was organized within the Immediate Office of the UC Provost in terms of human resources reporting and budgeting. In 2020, ILTI was moved to the new department of Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs (GUEA) within the Division of Academic Affairs as part of a larger divisional restructuring. ILTI is currently co-led by a team of three leaders who currently report to the Vice President for Graduate and Undergraduate Affairs / Vice Provost for Equity and Inclusion:

- A Chief Financial Officer & Marketing Director leads the Marketing, Finance, and Student Support team;
- A Program Director leads the Program Management and Enrollment Operations team; and
- A Director of Course Design and Development who leads the Course Design, Technical Development and Operations team.

These three Directors collectively oversee the program’s day-to-day activities, supervise the remainder of ILTI’s immediate staff, and make decisions on behalf of the Initiative. They serve as voting members of the Steering Committee and, until 2020, reported directly to the UC Provost.
While the size of the office has grown considerably in the past five years – with personnel costs growing 140% from $1.2 million to $2.8 million in FY17 – it is important to recognize that ILTI has been ramping up its activities over that time period as well and developing the Initiative from scratch. ILTI had roughly 22 employees and vacant positions at the time of assessment. The following organizational chart describes their structure in more detail.

**Governance**

ILTI is currently led by a six-member Steering Committee which provides general oversight for the program by advising on academic policies that impact ILTI courses, advocating for online education across the UC system, reviewing competitive RFP applications, approving allocation of the program’s competitive course awards, and reviewing program reports related to course evaluations and campus use of funds.

Decisions that impact the objectives of ILTI, the scope of its work, or the use of its funds must be approved by the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee meets biweekly for two hours, and meetings are occasionally supported by other ILTI staff.
### TABLE 1: ILTI STEERING COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Provost &amp; Executive Vice President</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>UC Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chair</td>
<td>UC Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Course Design, Technical Development, &amp; Operations</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Division, ILTI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO and Marketing Director</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Division, ILTI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Division, ILTI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Since its inception, ILTI has achieved several significant accomplishments, including:

- A technical system that facilitates enrollment between campuses, an almost unheard-of feat in American higher education;
- Hundreds of innovative online courses that have served thousands of students across the campuses; and
- Increased interest in and adoption of online instructional modalities amongst our faculty.

As such, ILTI has made substantial and important progress toward the goals that Governor Brown established when he first offered funding to UC in 2012-2013 to invest in online education. UC campuses as well have created new capacity for development of online education infrastructure.

There exists opportunity now to rethink the role and administrative function of ILTI so that it better supports the evolution of online education at UC, for a broader array of academic endeavors, and via streamlined organizational and funding structures.

Vision Statement

Online education efforts at the UC Office of the President have evolved over the years from the UC Online Education (UCOE) efforts of the early 2010s to ILTI in the past five years. The mission and vision for these efforts have changed over time due to leadership transitions; differences in perspective between the campuses, faculty, and the UC Office of the President; and the evolution of campus infrastructure and capacity to develop and deliver online courses for both their own matriculated students and those who are cross-enrolled.

With the assumption that the annual funding allocation from the State of California will continue, the following vision statement was developed based on consultation with stakeholders during the assessment phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Statement:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University of California will invest in online education to ensure all of its students can access high-quality, relevant courses through digital modalities that advance their academic careers, foster critical learning outcomes, and help them graduate on-time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This vision is intended to be narrowly focused to ensure the limited funding is spent judiciously and can make an impact on this scope of effort.

Goals

The UC Provost and leaders across the UC system identified five main goals that will help support and achieve this vision over the next few years.
TABLE 2: FUTURE GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Systemwide Oversight</td>
<td>Ensure systemwide oversight over the funding priorities and administration of the funding, involving stakeholders from the campus administrations, Academic Senate, and UC Office of the President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Complement Campus Efforts</td>
<td>Ensure that funds are spent in a way that complements existing campus efforts and priorities and does not create competition between systemwide and campus efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Leveraging Assets</td>
<td>Leverage assets and resources available on the campuses and in the UC Office of the President to ensure efforts are not duplicated and administrative costs are kept low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Broad Applicability</td>
<td>Where possible, fund activities that support broader systemwide academic priorities, including, but not limited to, online education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Maximize the amount of funds that are spent towards fulfilling the University's mission and the state vision and minimize administrative effort to manage the funds and related activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

Several changes have been and should be made to ILTI’s structure, resources, support, and the way in which the funding has been allocated to help achieve the goals and the strategic vision articulated above.

This section describes three recommendations for restructuring what is now ILTI:

- Eliminate the Non-Matriculated Student enrollment efforts previously branded as UC Online.
- Replace what is now collectively known as ILTI with a long-term program branded as UC Online. As a new program, UC Online should:
  - Provide funding for and support the development of new online courses;
  - Manage cross-campus enrollment systems and operations to cover most means of enrolling across campuses, including UC Washington Center, UC Center Sacramento, etc.; and
  - Coordinate systemwide instructional technology support, including providing technical assistance and instructional design support, establishing standards, and negotiating systemwide contracts.
- Structure UC Online administration and governance to streamline functions, reduce administrative costs and burden, and ensure more campus perspective, input and collaboration in decision-making.

The following sections outline these recommendations in more detail.
Recommendation 1: Eliminate Non-Matriculated Student Enrollment

UC should eliminate the non-matriculated student enrollment effort known as UC Online. A significant number of stakeholders, including campus registrars and vice chancellors/deans of undergraduate education, ILTI staff, and leadership from the UC Office of the President recommend eliminating efforts to enroll non-matriculated students because the effort offered little value to the UC system. Among the issues highlighted:

- Low enrollments averaging 100 non-matriculated students per year across the entire UC system;
- Annual deficits incurred from years of losing money, and although the non-matriculated student enrollments had started to turn a small profit in recent years, UC Online has not yet broken even on total costs;
- Brand confusion between the non-matriculated student enrollment effort, called UC Online, and the UC undergraduate enrollment efforts, leading some campuses to brand both of them as UC Online;
- Unnecessary competition with UC Extension given that Extension also offers online courses to non-matriculated students;
- Enrollment issues highlighted by campus staff in tracking these students in courses and ensuring they have access to the appropriate systems; and
- Sporadic course offerings given that the faculty must opt-into enrolling non-matriculated students, leading to a non-strategic and disparate list of course offerings.

While some of these issues could be addressed or mitigated in the future, many stakeholders noted that the non-matriculated students diverted attention from the larger UC undergraduate student enrollments and that profit-generating educational activities were not a core competency of the UC Office of the President. When factoring in the opportunity costs of the staff time for supporting enrollment of non-matriculated students with the marketing and hard costs of running the effort, UC Online for non-matriculated students offers more issues and disadvantages for the UC system as a whole than benefits.

It should be noted that the Division of Academic Affairs eliminated non-matriculated programming in August 2019. Staff who support both UC undergraduate and non-matriculated student enrollments now focus solely on UC undergraduate enrollments, and efforts are underway in 2020 to identify opportunities for FTE and position consolidation that result from reorganization within the Division and creation of a new department of Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs.

3 Non-matriculated student efforts ended in August 2019 in tandem with UCOP and Academic Affairs restructuring efforts already underway.
Recommendation 2: Create a New UC Online Program

UC should streamline and restructure the remaining components of ILTI into a new systemwide academic program called **UC Online**. As a new program, UC Online should:

- Provide **funding** for and support the development of new online courses;
- Manage **cross-campus enrollment** systems and operations to cover most means of enrolling across campuses, including UC Washington Center, UC Center Sacramento, etc.; and
- Coordinate **instructional technology** support for a broader array of campus online education endeavors, including providing technical assistance and instructional design support, establishing standards, and negotiating systemwide contracts.

The new UC Online program should also be funded by the existing commitment dedicated to online education, with efforts made internally to identify cost savings and streamline expenses with a goal of redirecting 60 percent of current ILTI funding to campuses via block or competitive grants.

The following sections describe these functions in more detail.

**A. Fund and Develop New Online Courses**

In the ILTI model, campuses receive funds through nine different funding streams, each with narrowly defined purposes and reporting requirements. A new UC Online should comprise no more than two grant opportunities:

- **Campus block grants**: The new UC Online program should offer funds to the Executive Vice Chancellors/Provosts to invest in online education and course development on their campuses. 4
- **Systemwide competition**: Similar to the current state, the new UC Online program should manage a competitive process where faculty can submit proposals to fund online course development.

In both cases it is recommended that reporting requirements be streamlined, and campuses provide an annual report describing how they have spent the funds and the outcomes they have achieved. Since the $10 million in funding from the State is affirmed through a “handshake” agreement, there are no formal requirements for reporting on the use of funds, and the new UC Online should adhere to current UCOP reporting practices for state funds.

The following sections provide additional detail on these two types of grants.

**Campus Block Grants**

The Campus Block Grants are tied to campus funding needs to help promote online education writ large at the campuses and capped at an amount to be determined. Each campus is awarded a Block Grant annually based on a simple proposal that describes their plans. Awards are distributed to campus Executive Vice Chancellors/Provosts to be used according to the campus proposal.

---

Systemwide Competition

The Systemwide Competition should focus on soliciting and funding proposals to develop online courses that meet one or both of the following criteria and are comparable in dollar amount to campus-level awards for online course development to avoid confusion and perverse incentives that come from award amounts that are significantly higher than those offered by the campus:

- **Innovation**: Courses that innovatively leverage the online medium for instructional delivery; and
- **High demand**: Courses that, when offered online and across campuses, will help alleviate the stress of high student demand on campuses.

UC should establish a faculty review committee to evaluate each proposal based on established criteria. Staff support for the competitive grants program will identify the steps and calendar for the application cycles, communicate criteria, support campuses and faculty to submit applications, and provide support to the proposal review panels for their decision-making processes.

B. Manage Cross-Campus Enrollments and Operations

Although stakeholders noted the difficulty and cost of developing and deploying the Cross-Campus Enrollment System (CCES) over the past five years, most felt that CCES should be leveraged and expanded to cover as many academic programs as possible. The Division of Academic Affairs should also undertake additional assessment to determine whether support, staffing and ownership for CCES can be more sustainably managed in the future. This section includes some considerations for that additional assessment.

Because of the successful development of the CCES, many ILTI staff and a clear majority of campus registrars felt that UC should leverage the system on a greater scale to automatically and digitally transfer course registrations and grades between campus Student Information Systems for students enrolled in other multi-campus academic programs.

These additional multi-campus programs could include systemwide academic programs such as:

- **UC Education Abroad Program (UCEAP)**: A systemwide study abroad program that is jointly administered by the UC Office of the President and UC Santa Barbara and requires transferring students’ course registrations between UCEAP’s in-house systems and the student information systems at the nine undergraduate campuses;
- **UC Center Sacramento (UCCS)**: An experiential learning program in Sacramento that is jointly administered by the UC Office of the President and UC Davis and requires transferring grades between the student information system at UC Davis and the systems at the eight other undergraduate campuses; and
- **UC Washington Center (UCDC)**: An experiential learning program in Washington, DC that is administered solely by the UC Office of the President and requires transferring grades between the student information systems at all nine of the undergraduate campuses.

All of these academic programs coordinate their own independent registration, enrollment, and grading processes through unique systems and handle these enrollment operations differently. They each interface regularly with campus faculty, registrars, and enrollment management staff in ways that each could be streamlined through the CCES. Leaders of these other programs expressed interest in leveraging the
CCES to transfer student registrations and grades, contingent upon the appropriate design of the system and its ability to meet their needs.

In addition to these systemwide academic programs, campus stakeholders – especially the registrars – also suggested expanding the scope of the CCES to support other options for cross-campus enrollment, including:

- **Intercampus exchange**: This enrollment option allows UC graduate students to enroll in courses offered at another UC campus for credit at their home campuses;
- **Intercampus visitor**: This enrollment option allows UC undergraduate and graduate students to study full-time at another UC campus for one quarter or semester and transfer the enrollments/grades from that term to their home campus for credit; and
- **Simultaneous enrollment**: This enrollment option allows UC undergraduates and graduate students to enroll in one course per semester at another UC campus and receive credit for those courses at their home campuses.

Many campus registrars noted that they currently transfer the enrollments and grades for students enrolled in these systemwide programs and cross-campus enrollment options by sending paper or electronic records between the campus Registrar offices and then manually entering the records into their Student Information Systems. This was partly due to the small number of enrollments in these programs and enrollment options – for example, UCCS enrolls roughly 160 students per year and UCDC enrolls roughly 530 students per year systemwide. Some of the cross-campus enrollment options – like the Intercampus Visitor option – are even smaller and projected to number in the dozens of students per year, though exact numbers are not easily ascertained since these enrollments are not centrally tracked. Many of the registrars noted that it is cheaper for them to manage these enrollments through manual entry because the cost of independently developing automated or technical solutions would be prohibitively higher than the cost of manually entering the records in their existing systems. However, several campus stakeholders noted that the time required to manually enter grades for students enrolled in these programs or options can create issues for the students because it can delay their ability to generate transcripts, show potential employers and graduate schools their grades, and receive their diplomas during graduation (since their transcripts may not be finalized).

Some stakeholders from the campuses and the UC Office of the President suggested that the CCES could potentially also be leveraged to manage transfer credits, particularly from the California Community Colleges. Though expanding the CCES to cover some transfer credits could offer the highest potential value to the UC system of all the enrollment options identified, it would also likely require the highest investment and may not be technically feasible given the complexity in the transfer credit system.

If UC does decide to expand the scope of the CCES, leadership from Academic Affairs, the Information Technology Services department, and the campus registrars should assess the relative costs of expanding this system to cover the systemwide programs, cross-campus enrollment options, and transfer credits. UC will need to justify the cost of such an investment by showing that the benefits outweigh the costs.

The perceived benefits of expanding the CCES include:

- **Reducing manual data entry** by the campus Registrar offices to record course registrations and grades for their students enrolled in these programs or options;
- **Increasing data quality and consistency** by ensuring data is transferred according to a set of common rules and parameters (assuming that the system is appropriately configured and tested);
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- **Minimizing delays in generating student transcripts/grades** that arise from the time required for the Registrar offices to manually enter grades into their Student Information Systems; and
- **Reducing administrative effort** from the systemwide programs and the campuses in managing and tracking these cross-campus registrations and grades.

**CCES Support Structure**

Currently, ILTI manages the CCES through an in-house technology team with roughly five budgeted positions which report to one of ILTI’s directors. Several stakeholders noted several issues with this structure, including:

- **Unsustainable staffing model**: The small size of the team means that any vacancies or leaves of absence put the system at risk;
- **Limited technical competencies**: The CCES team reports to the program leadership of ILTI within the Academic Affairs division, but technology and software is not necessarily a core competency of the Academic Affairs division; and
- **Compliance risk**: Given that the small technical team within ILTI does not have a formal connection with the Information Technology Systems department, there is a risk that the system is developed or configured in a way that is out of compliance with UC policies and practices.

The Information Technology Systems department (ITS) within the Chief Operating Officer division currently has over 200 FTE devoted to supporting dozens of systems used by the UC Office of the President and the campuses. ITS partners with many other departments within the UC Office of the President by managing their systems at cost. In these partnerships, the departments appoint a “Business Owner” who is responsible for owning the functionality, requirements, and usage of the systems, while ITS is responsible for updating, testing, and configuring the systems. Some leaders from the UC Office of the President and ILTI staff suggested that the CCES should be managed in a similar way to help mitigate the issues and risks previously identified.

The Division of Academic Affairs and its department of Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs should conduct additional assessment to determine whether technical ownership of the CCES can be transferred to the ITS department within the UC Office of the President while maintaining functional or “business” ownership of the system within GUEA. This would require transferring the budget and FTE for the technical team and their associated expenses to ITS, and identifying a business owner within the department who oversees the functionality of the system.

If this recommendation is implemented, over time, ITS should integrate the technical team into its organizational structure to ensure appropriate integration and collaboration with other technical teams, and to gain leverage from the larger department. This would also require the creation of a clear set of expectations and division of responsibilities between GUEA and ITS for the CCES through a Service Level Agreement or comparable document. Should CCES expand to support other academic programs within Academic Affairs, similar SLAs can be developed between GUEA and those departments for support.

Business ownership responsibilities include:

- **Initial implementation**: Overseeing the remaining CCES implementation amongst the campuses to support ILTI's online courses, as this implementation has not yet been completed;
- **Issue resolution**: Identifying issues in the system that should be addressed and overseeing their resolution or mitigation;
• **Needs identification**: Working with campus and systemwide stakeholders to identify needs and requirements for the system; and

• **Major upgrades**: Guiding the decision-making process and overseeing any approved expansions of the CCES to support other systemwide programs, cross-campus enrollment options, and possibly transfer credits.

ILTI previously has provided funds to the campuses to support necessary upgrades and enhancements to their Student Information Systems to support integration through the CCES. The future business owner CCES should work with ITS to determine whether additional funds should be provided to the campuses. Any additional funds should be allocated from the existing funding commitment.

In a future assessment, Academic Affairs and GUEA should identify potential risks in transitioning technical oversight of the CCES to ITS – most notably the risk of reduced customer service and adaptability by splitting oversight of the system across two UCOP divisions. However, many stakeholders felt that restructuring the oversight and management of the CCES would offer several major benefits which would outweigh these risks, including:

• **Cost efficiency**: The long-term cost of managing the CCES will likely decrease given the possibility of leveraging the larger technical organization and greater capabilities within ITS;

• **Long-term sustainability**: The CCES will likely be more sustainable and face fewer technical issues by ensuring technical oversight from ITS;

• **Functional oversight**: Maintaining business/functional oversight within the Division to oversee the CCES would ensure that the academic enterprise is still setting the direction for and owning the system; and

• **Probability of success**: It is unlikely that the current technical team, given its small size and limited leverage, could successfully manage the system upgrades required to support the other systemwide programs and cross-campus enrollment options.

Transitioning the technical team to ITS and establishing a business owner may require staffing changes. Should a decision be made to implement this recommendation, the Vice President/Vice Provost for GUEA will need to work closely with the Chief Operating Officer and Chief Information Officer within the UC Office of the President to manage these transitions and develop a Service Level Agreement or comparable document outlining the expectations of this partnership.

**Enrollment Operations**

The new UC Online program should have a team of individuals dedicated to supporting cross-campus enrollment in online courses. This team should include support from the UC Merced Students First Center in addition to some internal staff. The primary goals of this team should be:

• Developing and maintaining a catalogue of online courses that are open for cross-campus enrollment;

• Supporting students who want to or are enrolled in the courses;

• Coordinating cross-campus enrollments with the registrars to resolve issues and ensure seamless registration and access; and

• Supporting faculty who are offering the courses.
C. Coordinate Systemwide Instructional Technology Efforts

UC Online can represent an expansion of focus beyond ILTI-specific instructional technology to include coordinating broader systemwide efforts related to instructional technology. In ILTI currently there is one instructional technology position (Assistant Director of Learning Platforms). Several campus stakeholders and some ILTI staff noted that there was significant duplication of effort across the campuses regarding the identification, evaluation, and negotiation of contracts for instructional technology systems. There are several federal and state laws and regulations that impact instructional technology systems, and the campuses largely navigate the selection and configuration of these systems independently in the current state.

In a future state, instructional technology within UC Online would help the UC system as a whole by coordinating efforts to:

- Establish standards and guidelines for instructional technology systems;
- Evaluate instructional technology vendors consistently to determine whether they meet the approved guidelines and standards;
- Negotiate systemwide contracts for instructional technology systems; and
- Identify best practices for instructional technology and communicate those best practices across the campuses.

A position dedicated to instructional technology within the UC Online organization could be responsible for:

- **Convening campus leadership** focused on instructional technology;
- **Evaluating systems and negotiating with vendors** on behalf of the broader UC system;
- **Tracking existing contracts** to allow campuses to leverage negotiated agreements from other UC entities;
- **Maintaining guidelines and standards** for instructional technology systems based on feedback and guidance from campus leadership;
- **Managing instructional technology systems** that are utilized by systemwide academic programs, like ILTI's online courses, and any common systems that are licensed by the UC system as a whole; and
- **Coordinating with other departments** within the UC Office of the President, including ITS for technical expertise and Systemwide Procurement for contract negotiation.

The campuses will continue to own their own instructional technology systems to ensure they are serving the unique needs of their students and faculty. However, increased coordination amongst the campuses on instructional technology could provide the following benefits:

- **De-duplication**: By offering a single set of guidelines, vendor evaluations, and systemwide contracts, UC should be able to reduce the duplication of efforts across the campuses;
- **Cost reduction**: By leveraging the buying power of the ten campuses, UC should be able to reduce aggregate spending on instructional technology; and
- **Programmatic support**: This position would still be able to ensure that the ILTI online courses that leverage the current instructional technology systems are supported.

**Instructional Design**

The new UC Online program should have a team of individuals dedicated to offering instructional design support to faculty who are awarded grants to develop online courses. Many current faculty and campus
stakeholders identified the current instructional design team within ILTI as a strength. Faculty should be able to use their own campus-based instructional designers in the future, as they are currently, or to leverage the instructional design team within ILTI.

Periodic review of campus need should be conducted to ensure that there is not duplication between central instructional design support and campus internal instructional design capabilities. Over time, the team can evolve to provide capacity-building support beyond design, including professional development and training and establishing systemwide best practices.
Recommendation 3: Restructure Administration and Governance

The new UC Online program will be administratively located at UCOP in the department of Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs within the Division of Academic Affairs. This change should become effective July 1, 2020, when GUEA will launch as a new UCOP department. This relocation will allow a new UC Online to leverage the resources of a larger department — including budget, human resources and administrative communications, among others — and eliminate some operational duplication.

However, the new UC Online program should be governed by a group that includes campus leadership and should rely more heavily on support from other units within the campuses and the UC Office of the President to accomplish its mission.

A. Leadership

A new UC Online program will require a single leader who oversees the UC Online organization and is moreover responsible for representing at the system, state and national levels UC’s systemwide engagement in online education. The leader oversees the three teams that support UC Online’s key functions: grant-making, cross-campus enrollment operations and instructional technology.

Considerations for a leader of UC Online include:

- **Faculty status**: Because the new UC Online will be an academic program, the leader should be a currently tenured faculty member from one of the UC campuses with expertise in online education and instructional technology. This would be different than the current leadership structure, where none of the Directors have faculty appointments. This would make UC Online similar to other systemwide academic programs, like UCDC, UCCS, and the UC Education Abroad Program (UCEAP).
- **Appointment term**: The leader should be appointed on five-year terms, as the leaders of other comparable systemwide academic programs are (e.g., UCDC, UCEAP).
- **Reporting**: The leader should report to the Vice President for Graduate and Undergraduate Affairs/Vice Provost for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion.

The new leader should be recruited at the UCOP Executive Director level.

B. Governance

A new UC Online should leverage best practices for governance from other systemwide academic programs, like UCDC, UCEAP, and the Multicampus Research Units (MRUs). Future governance should include representation from campus leaders at all ten of the UC campuses, in addition to leadership from the Academic Senate.

A **Governing Council** should replace the current six-member Steering Committee and should be responsible for overseeing the operations, budget, strategic plan, annual reporting, and for reviewing the performance of the Executive Director on a recurring basis. The membership of the Governing Council should include senior UC management and representatives of the systemwide Academic Senate. The members are appointed by the University Provost and campus Executive Vice Chancellors. The Governing Council advises on the selection of the Executive Director, authorizes the annual operating budget,
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establishes annual program goals within a strategic planning framework, and provides oversight of overall operations.

The Governing Council would be responsible for advising the Executive Director on the operations, strategic direction, and evaluation of the new UC Online program. This committee would ultimately be responsible for:

- **Governance documents**: Approving the program’s budget, annual reports, strategic plan, and program charter as proposed by the Executive Director and staff;
- **ED performance**: Reviewing the performance of the Executive Director on an annual basis and providing feedback to the Vice President / Vice Provost;
- **ED recruitment**: Supporting and advising the Vice President / Vice Provost on the recruitment of a new Executive Director when the position needs to be refilled; and
- **Advice and guidance**: Advising the Executive Director on the operations, direction, and vision for the program.

Ideally the Governing Council would be comprised of a combination of administrators and staff, with no more than twelve individuals – eleven members and the chair. The Council would have representatives from the UC Office of the President and many of the campuses. The Executive Director, Vice President/Vice Provost and Chair of the Academic Senate would serve as *ex-officio* members of the Governing Council.

To better support the new UC Online program and ensure appropriate governance and accountability of its finances and operations, the program should also establish the following guiding documents:

- A formal **charter**, updated at least every five years, that outlines the general roles, responsibilities, structures, and expectations for the program and involved parties;
- A five-year **strategic plan** that establishes the program’s goals and identifies means of accomplishing those goals;
- An annual **operating budget** that identifies the planned revenues, expenditure of funds, and net position of the program for the upcoming fiscal year, along with an analysis of the actual financials from the current and prior fiscal years; and
- An **annual report** for stakeholders and governance committees that highlights key metrics such as enrollment statistics, courses developed, and progress towards goals.

Ultimately, the Governing Committee for the new UC Online program should have ultimate approval authority over grant proposals, including establishing funding caps for campus block awards and competitive faculty grants. The Governing Council should also approve the amount of the awards based on an understanding of comparable awards offered by the campuses.

**C. External Support**

Academic Affairs and GUEA should undertake additional assessment to determine whether the new UC Online program can leverage support from several groups within the UC Office of the President and on the campuses. These include:

- The **Research Grants Program Office (RGPO)**, which could help administer grant funding and manage the post-award review processes; and
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- A group of Campus Representatives, who can help to advertise and market the program to students and faculty on their campuses.

RGPO is a team of over 40 individuals dedicated to managing grant application processes and analyzing grant expenses through post-award reviews. RGPO has been primarily focused on research grants in the past decade, like the State-funded programs on tobacco-related diseases, HIV/AIDS, and breast cancer, but it has an effective infrastructure that many stakeholders and leaders within the UC Office of the President felt could be leveraged to administer UC Online’s grants in the future. For example, RGPO has a robust post-award management team that reviews grant expenses to ensure compliance – ILTI currently manages its own post-award process internally. Also, RGPO uses proposalCENTRAL to manage its grant applications, just as ILTI has in the past (ILTI and RGPO used separate instances of this program).

In addition Academic Affairs and GUEA should assess the efficacy of establishing a team comprised of one or two Campus Representatives from each of the nine undergraduate UC campuses who would be responsible for helping to advertise and market the cross-campus online courses with their student bodies. This would mimic the Campus Representative structures for UCDC and UCCS, which campus stakeholders noted worked fairly well at marketing those programs.

ILTI currently manages marketing internally through social media advertisements and some outreach to students. Most campus stakeholders felt that marketing these courses would be best accomplished by individuals working on the campuses who are closest to the students. UC Merced successfully employed two student interns as well, using ILTI funding, to market the courses to their undergraduate population. This campus-based marketing approach generated more interest than ever before on that campus, and could be a model for the future as well. The new UC Online program may need to offer some funding to the campuses to support marketing efforts.

Support from these two groups would help reduce the need for the finance and marketing functions currently within ILTI. Eliminating these functions may moreover help increase funds for grants and reduce headcount for the new program.

D. Additional Recommendations

Academic Affairs and GUEA should also make several changes related to the current state of ILTI and the funds that have been provided to the campuses, including:

- Relaxing restrictions on fund balances that the campuses currently have from ILTI;
- Evaluating all reporting requirements to ensure they are appropriate and necessary for the operation of the program.

Most campuses are carrying some fund balances from ILTI that are earmarked for specific purposes tied to the nine funding categories (e.g., infrastructure development, course development, course maintenance). Restrictions on those funds should be relaxed to allow the Executive Vice Chancellors/Provosts to spend the funds however is most beneficial to their campuses based on individual priorities, so long as the funds are spent to support online education. In the future, funds should be earmarked by the campuses based on the two categories of funding identified previously.

5 In response to COVID-19, restrictions were eliminated in Spring 2020 to allow campuses to use carryover funds to improve instructional resiliency and address campus-specific needs.
In addition, a new UC Online program should closely evaluate the need for any reporting requirements from the campuses – specifically on how the campuses spend granted funds and enrollments in the online courses. All requirements for reporting from the campuses should be approved by the Governing Committee and be structured to minimize administrative burden the campuses, while meeting the operational needs of the program.
CONCLUSION

ILTI has successfully achieved many of its initial goals over the past few years, including developing the cross-campus enrollment system (a first for American higher education) and funding hundreds of online courses. Many stakeholders, especially the faculty, felt that ILTI’s goals were appropriate and helped advance online education across the UC system. However, ILTI has faced several challenges and the UC system is in a different place now than it was when ILTI was first founded. Now is an appropriate time to reevaluate the structure and priorities for the existing funding commitment for online education.

Most campus stakeholders feel that the future systemwide online education efforts should remain within the UC Office of the President, but most also felt that it was appropriate to reenvision how the funding is spent and how the program is structured to make the best use of subject matter expertise and funding. There were several opportunities identified to accomplish these aims, including:

- Eliminate the Non-Matriculated Student enrollment efforts previously branded as UC Online.
- Replace what is now collectively known as ILTI with a new long-term program branded as UC Online. As a new program, UC Online should be positioned to support a broader array of academic programs than ILTI is currently serving. Within a new UC Online, this expansion can include deploying the Cross-Campus Enrollment System to cover most means of enrolling across campuses, and position instructional technology and design supports to better address common systemwide needs for standards, practices, training and procurement.
- As a new UC Online, restructure administration and governance to streamline functions, reduce administrative burden, and ensure more campus perspective, input and collaboration in future decision-making.

Notably, several functions that are currently performed by ILTI would not be required in the future or could be managed by other groups. Ultimately, Provost Brown and the President of the University will need to decide on the future state for ILTI, and whether and how to implement these recommendations.
APPENDIX

Appendix I: List of Interviews

In total, 39 stakeholders were interviewed during the course of this assessment, including 13 ILTI employees and 14 campus stakeholders. The number of stakeholders interviewed from relevant groups are highlighted below, but there is some overlap between those numbers since certain individuals involved appear in multiple groups.

- **Steering Committee**: 6 of 6 interviewed;
- **ILTI Staff**: 13 of 19 interviewed;
- **Campus Registrars**: 7 of 10 interviewed (with three Associate and Deputy Registrars as well);
- **Campus Vice Presidents and Deans of Undergraduate Education (VPDUEs)**: 4 of 9 interviewed; and
- **Additional Stakeholders**: 7 total interviewed.

Each stakeholder interview was conducted by a team of two interviewers. Each interviewee was presented with the same interview prompt in advance of the interview, which was used to guide the conversation. After each interview, notes from both interviewers were reviewed and compared, and the primary topics of discussion were extracted as themes.

The table below lists all staff within ILTI who were interviewed for this assessment and their titles. Note that all of these individuals are employed by the UC Office of the President or UC Merced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael T. Brown</td>
<td>Provost and Executive Vice President</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert May</td>
<td>Vice-Chair of the Academic Senate, 2017-18</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane White</td>
<td>Chair of the Academic Senate, 2017-18</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Montoya</td>
<td>CFO and Marketing Director</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary-Ellen Kreher</td>
<td>Director of Course Design, Technical Development, and Operations</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Osmundson</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Friese</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Instructional Design</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Moy Harmon</td>
<td>Associate Director, Online Strategic Partnerships &amp; Programs</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Hochman</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Technology Development</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Kemp</td>
<td>Enrollment Operations</td>
<td>UC Office of the President &amp; UC Merced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice McElhaney</td>
<td>Financial Analyst</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha Rogers</td>
<td>Program Analyst</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Roper</td>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Rosenzweig</td>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary C. Wong</td>
<td>Program Analyst</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Wood</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Learning Technology Platforms</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table below lists all campus stakeholders who were interviewed for this assessment and their titles.

### TABLE 4: INTERVIEW LIST OF CAMPUS STAKEHOLDERS, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registrar</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leesa Beck</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>UC Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Bennett</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>UC Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracken Dailey</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>UC Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Herbrand</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>UC Merced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Jakway</td>
<td>Associate Registrar</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire McCluskey</td>
<td>Associate Registrar</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchad Sanger</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>UC Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Wada</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Webb</td>
<td>Deputy Registrar</td>
<td>UC Merced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Wong</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vice Provosts and Deans for Undergraduate Education (VPDUEs)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Koshland</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Thomas</td>
<td>Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>UC Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene Tromp</td>
<td>Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost</td>
<td>UC Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Turner</td>
<td>Vice Provost and Dean, Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Liaisons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Dennin</td>
<td>Dean of Division of Undergraduate Education and Vice Provost of Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>UC Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Hodgkiss</td>
<td>Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning and Resources</td>
<td>UC Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Larive</td>
<td>Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost</td>
<td>UC Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Reiff</td>
<td>Academic Senate Liaison for Online Education</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Tassio</td>
<td>Assistant Director for Online Education</td>
<td>UC Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Blake</td>
<td>Professor, Spanish and Chair of Designated Emphasis in Second Language Acquisition</td>
<td>UC Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Brauer</td>
<td>Online Instruction and Online Technologies Coordinator, School of Humanities</td>
<td>UC Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abel Chuang</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>UC Merced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliette Levy</td>
<td>Associate Professor, History</td>
<td>UC Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Simon</td>
<td>Associate Teaching Professor, Education Studies</td>
<td>UC San Diego</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below lists all other UC stakeholders, most from within the UC Office of the President, who were interviewed for this assessment and their titles.
TABLE 5: INTERVIEW LIST OF OTHER UC STAKEHOLDERS, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steering Committee Members (Non-ILTI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael T. Brown</td>
<td>Provost and Executive Vice President</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert May</td>
<td>Vice-Chair of the Academic Senate</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane White</td>
<td>Chair of the Academic Senate</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Systemwide Program Leaders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Carlson</td>
<td>Vice Provost, Academic Personnel &amp; Programs</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian-Lee Nyitray</td>
<td>Associate Vice Provost &amp; Executive Director, UCEAP</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Shapiro</td>
<td>Executive Director, UC Washington Center (UCDC)</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Diascro</td>
<td>Associate Academic Director, UC Washington Center (UCDC)</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Simmons</td>
<td>Associate Director, UC Center Sacramento</td>
<td>UC Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Stakeholders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Andriola</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Russi</td>
<td>Executive Director, UCPath Center</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Lloyd</td>
<td>Chief Risk Officer</td>
<td>UC Office of the President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II: List of Documents and Data

Forty-three documents and datasets were analyzed. These documents were provided by a variety of constituent groups, including ILTI staff, campus stakeholders, and other stakeholders from the UC Office of the President.

The table below lists the 34 documents and datasets that were received directly from ILTI staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2016-2021 ILTI Project Statement Draft</td>
<td>Project statement outlining first three years of progress, the May 2016 all-campus review, and the five-year outlook</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A4 Instructional Innovation</td>
<td>ILTI Regents Item from May 2018</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CCES Document Hub</td>
<td>Portal with an assortment of documents related to the CCES, its maintenance, its background, and the processes it supports</td>
<td>FY12-FY17</td>
<td>WEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CCES Hub Interfaces Documentation (API Portal Documents)</td>
<td>Portal with documents related to the CCES, APIs, and various technical processes</td>
<td>FY12-FY17</td>
<td>WEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CCES Overview Video (Higher Ed Summit 2017)</td>
<td>Video presentation about the CCES developed and delivered by ILTI staff at the 2017 Higher Ed Summit</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>VIDEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CCES Service Level Agreement with campuses</td>
<td>Service Level Agreement between ILTI and campuses with respect to the operation of the Cross-Campus Enrollment System</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CCES System Integration Overview</td>
<td>Technical specifications document for the CCES and its component applications</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cross-Campus Enrollment Data - Approvals and Reasons</td>
<td>Enrollment data for cross-campus enrollees in cross-campus courses offered between AY14-AY18 as of June 2018</td>
<td>AY14-AY18</td>
<td>XLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Estimated Budget Request for ITS Support</td>
<td>Preliminary budget estimate between ILTI and UCOP Information Technology Services (ITS) with respect to website maintenance and development support ILTI intends to request from ITS for FY17-198</td>
<td>FY17-18</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Graduate &amp; Professional Program Market Analysis</td>
<td>Internal research conducted by ILTI staff to explore the online Graduate and Professional education industry and the potential for ILTI to enter it</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>WEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ILTI Course Catalog</td>
<td>Full course catalog by campus and discipline as of October 2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ILTI Course List</td>
<td>Full list of ILTI-supported courses as of July 2018, including host campus, date added to catalog, and funding detail</td>
<td>AY12-AY17</td>
<td>XLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ILTI Cross-Campus Funding – Transfers and Expenditure Reporting Summary</td>
<td>Campus use-of-funds data detailing expended and unexpended campus transfer funds from FY13-FY17</td>
<td>FY13-FY17</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>ILTI Dean-Senior Administrator Agreement</td>
<td>Campus Dean agreement regarding the use of ILTI funding and guidelines</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ILTI EVC-P Agreement</td>
<td>Campus EVC agreement regarding the use of ILTI funding and guidelines</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ILTI Expenditures Guidelines</td>
<td>Expenditure guidelines for all ILTI awards given to campuses across the categories of funding (FY16-17)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ILTI First Four Years By The Numbers</td>
<td>Summary overview of goals, achievements, and funding for FY13-FY16</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ILTI Five Year Financial Summary - Huron</td>
<td>Summary of ILTI's financial activity from FY13-FY18, including the current-year forecast and next year proposed budget</td>
<td>FY13-FY18</td>
<td>XLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ILTI Organization Chart</td>
<td>Unit organization chart as of September 2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ILTI Project Statement Final</td>
<td>May 2013 project statement outlining ILTI structure, background, objectives, and needs for FY14</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ILTI Regents Presentation</td>
<td>Regents Presentation from May 2018</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ILTI RFP Process Data</td>
<td>Data on RFP applications from FY13-FY17, including application cycle, individual scores, award status, and award amount</td>
<td>FY13-FY17</td>
<td>XLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ILTI Student Support Cases</td>
<td>Student Support ticket data for cross-campus and home-campus enrollees in CCES courses, as well as for UC Online, from FY17-AY17</td>
<td>AY13-AY17</td>
<td>XLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ILTI SWOT</td>
<td>Results of an internal ILTI SWOT conducted in AY2016</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>WEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Non-Matriculated Student Enrollment Detail Adjusted</td>
<td>UC Online enrollment, payment, and course data from FY12-AY17, as of June 2018</td>
<td>FY12-AY17</td>
<td>XLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Policy Barriers Documentation</td>
<td>ILTI internal initiative to identify campus and UCEP policy barriers to ILTI activity as of June 2018</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>XLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Program Catalog, Offering Summaries</td>
<td>Summary statistics of courses offered by campus and discipline from FY12-AY17</td>
<td>AY12-AAY17</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>RFP Required Documents</td>
<td>Five documents with information that faculty are required to submit related to the RFP application</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Student Course Evaluation Summaries</td>
<td>17 individual course reports and 1 aggregate report based on student evaluation surveys on courses offered FY12-AY17 as of June 2018</td>
<td>AY13-AAY14</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>UC Merced Extensions MOU</td>
<td>Agreement between ILTI and UC Merced Extension; ILTI provides platform services to UCM Extension and its costs are recovered</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>UC Merced Student Support MOU</td>
<td>Agreement between ILTI and UC Merced Student First Center; ILTI contracts with UCM to provide our cross-campus student support</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>June 2016 All-Hands Meeting Presentation</td>
<td>Overview of 2016 conversion plan for transitioning contract staff positions to career positions</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>PPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>June 2016 All-Hands Meeting Agenda</td>
<td>Agenda for 2016 all-staff meeting concerning ILTI staffing transition</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>DOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>June 2016 Staffing List</td>
<td>List of ILTI staff as of June 2016, including contract start and end dates, job code description, and recruitment plan</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>PDF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table below lists the nine other documents and datasets that were received from campus and UC Office of the President stakeholders.

**TABLE 7: DOCUMENTS AND DATASETS FROM OTHER STAKEHOLDERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UC Irvine Enrollment Data</td>
<td>Enrollment data for a subset of UC Irvine’s ILTI courses from Winter 2017 to Winter 2018</td>
<td>AY17</td>
<td>DOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UC Merced Enrollment Data</td>
<td>Enrollment Data for UC Merced’s non-ILTI programs for AY2016</td>
<td>AY16</td>
<td>MSG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UCEAP IT Notes Related to CCES</td>
<td>Collection of thoughts and observations from UCEAP’s internal IT team on the possibility of leveraging ILTI’s CCES</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>DOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2017 Housing Allocation Reporting Template</td>
<td>Campus use-of-funds reporting template from the 2017 Housing Allocation project</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>DOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2017 Housing Allocation Reporting Cover Letter</td>
<td>Sample cover letter to accompany the campus use-of-funds reporting template</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>DOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2018 Housing Allocation Reporting Template</td>
<td>Campus use-of-funds reporting template for the 2018 Housing Allocation project</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>DOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2018 Housing Allocation Internal Message</td>
<td>UCOP internal message introducing the 2018 Housing Allocation project</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>MSG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2018 President’s Letter to Chancellors</td>
<td>President’s letter to the chancellors announcing the approval of the one-time housing assistance fund and the 2018 Housing Allocation project</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>DOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2018 Housing Allocation Memo</td>
<td>Memo announcing the approval of the one-time housing assistance fund and the 2018 Housing Allocation project</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>DOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Campus EdTech Ecosystems: Current Status</td>
<td>Tracking document used to track the work of the Educational Technology Leadership Council and their cataloging effort</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>WEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Campus EdTech Ecosystems: Engagement Request to ITLC</td>
<td>Proposal to engage campus educational technology stakeholders for the purpose of sharing evaluation resources, considering a data repository, and standardizing the review and vetting process of educational technology tools.</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>WEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Campus EdTech Ecosystems: Original Findings</td>
<td>Final report from a cross-campus working group that assessed educational technology apps used and shared across the campuses</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>WEB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 2, 2020

ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR GAUVAIN

Dear Chair Gauvain:

This letter provides additional updated information to support Academic Council’s review of the report, *Innovative Learning Technology Initiatives: Recommendations for Future State*. In August 2020, Provost and Executive Vice President Michael T. Brown shared the report with the Academic Senate.

The review of ILTI was completed in 2018 by the Provost’s Office, with the assistance of Huron Consulting, to gain a better understanding of its current state and determine the best options for ILTI’s future. Timing challenges with Huron Consulting resulted in significant delays in the release of the report for Academic Senate review and feedback.

As noted in the report, some changes have already taken place as a result of organizational restructuring within Academic Affairs at the Office of the President. In addition, the COVID-19 transition to remote learning prompted early implementation of the funding model recommendations contained in the report. However, implementing other recommendations contained in the report is pending systemwide review and feedback. The attached update provides additional, relevant information to support that review.

Sincerely,

Yvette Gullatt  
Vice President for Graduate and Undergraduate Affairs and Vice Provost for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

Attachment

cc: Provost and Executive Vice President Brown  
   Vice Chair Horwitz  
   Executive Director Baxter  
   Chief of Staff Peterson  
   Director Do
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